

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LVI.

JULY, 1863.

ARTICLE I.

THE UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES OF THE CHURCH.

By Rev. W. B. SFEAGUE, D. D., Albany, N. Y.

In the kingdom of Nature, of Providence and of Grace, we find every where the operation of the principle of gradual development. The seed that is cast into the earth has, bound up in it, the sturdy oak that will ere long defy the blast of the tempest. The infant, opening its eyes upon the light for the first time, has within itself the elements of a power that may, by and by, move the world. An event, that seems altogether trivial at the time of its occurrence, may prove the germ of some great national convulsion, or revolution, or reformation. The Christian Church, originally consisting of a few individuals, of an ordinary type of intellect, and of no worldly consideration, has been gradually extending itself for almost two thousand years, until it is now represented in almost every portion of the globe. And yet the glory of the Church has only begun to appear; it has within it resources which are yet to be developed in a state of greatly increased purity and effi-

VOL. XIV. No. 56. 60

ciency, and in a progressive and finally universal extension. What then are the undeveloped resources of the Church?

In order to answer this question intelligently, we must understand definitely in what the *resources* of the Church consist. In one word, they consist of whatever is adapted to minister to the Church's prosperity or extension. We say to whatever is *adapted* to bring about this result; for many things are *over-ruled* for its accomplishment, which yet have no natural adaptedness to it. We know that God's purposes, and perfections, and promises are all pledged for the final complete triumph of the Church; and we know that he is always moving forward towards this grand issue, and that even the most hostile agencies, in which there seems a full embodiment of the spirit of evil, are, by his infinite wisdom and almighty power, rendered ultimately tributary to the advancement of his cause and the illustration of his glory. But this, surely, is not the divinely appointed instrumentality for doing God's work; for though *He* may render evil the minister of good, *our* only concern with evil is to avoid or resist it. He has prescribed the use of certain means for sustaining and carrying forward the interests of the Church, between which and the end at which they aim there is a natural and obvious connection. And these means constitute what we here intended by the *resources of the Church*. They are chiefly the following:

Talent, or good natural intellectual endowments. The slightest glance at mankind reveals to us the fact that there is great diversity in men's intellectual constitutions; and that this diversity has respect, not only to the proportions in which the different qualities are blended, but also to the general strength and completeness of the whole intellectual man. The multitude may be said to occupy, in this respect, about the same level; while here and there one towers far above the rest, and performs, for his every day work, what, to minds of an inferior order, seems well nigh miraculous. Now we are far from saying that intellects of only an ordinary capacity may not perform much good service for the Church—and that in various ways; but it is especially important that the *greater* lights should be put in requisition; that men of the largest comprehension, of the keenest discernment, of the greatest skill to encounter

difficulties, and the highest ability to control the popular mind, should be at the command of the Church, and ready to place their fine powers as a willing offering at her feet. While minds of a humbler mould are laboring diligently in the honorable sphere which Providence has marked out for them, (for there is no sphere of Christian duty that is not honorable,) the services of these more gifted minds are demanded on some wider or grander scale; perhaps to develop new plans, or to harmonize discordant influences, or to infuse fresh life and power into some languid and waning enterprise for good. Those who would know what the highest order of talent can accomplish in the pulpit, may read the sermons of Davies, and Dwight, and Mason, and a multitude of others; though even this will give but an inadequate idea of their power—and above all, let them read the history of Whitefield—his history rather than his sermons; for while he could sway a vast assembly, as no man of his day, or perhaps any other, ever could, the moment he put pen to paper, strangely enough, he dwindled into an ordinary man. And there is scarcely one of our great benevolent institutions, which has not had for its pillars great as well as good men; whose history could be written without revealing the workings of at least some one spirit that bore the stamp of true intellectual nobility.

As another of the resources of the Church, closely allied to the preceding, we may mention *learning*, or high intellectual acquisitions and accomplishments. There are two ways in which learning may be rendered subservient to the interests of the Church. This result may be accomplished indirectly, as the process, by which learning is acquired, is nothing more nor less than a process of intellectual culture, by means of which the faculties are developed and strengthened, and fitted to act with increased efficiency or to occupy a wider field. Or the influence may be direct; for while Christianity is the patroness of all sound learning, equally true is it that learning is one of the accredited auxiliaries of a pure Christianity. While all the various departments of knowledge may be rendered tributary, in some way, to the progress of human society, and ultimately to the well-being of the Church, there are certain branches that are indispensable to the proper elucidation of Scripture truth, and the legitimate workings of the Christian ministry. It is to a minute acquaintance with the languages, in which the Scriptures were originally written, as well

as with the whole science of Biblical interpretation, that we are indebted for the almost numberless auxiliaries to the study of the Bible, with which both the Church and her ministry are now favored; and as we believe that it is as true now as when the venerable Puritan Robinson recorded it, that "there is yet further light to break forth from God's word," so we cannot doubt that this is to be accomplished by the yet higher efforts of biblical and theological learning. Against the doctrine that learning is the natural ally of the pulpit it has sometimes been urged that those model preachers, the Apostles, were uneducated men; but the obvious answer to this is that while one of them at least actually *was* one of the most highly educated men of his time, they were all *inspired* men—they spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost—and this surely was far more than an off-set for the lack of human accomplishments. But herein was also manifested the wisdom of God; for their humble intellectual rank gave additional force to the wonderful success of their ministry, as a demonstration that they had received their commission from above. We admit, indeed, that learning may be, and often has been, perverted to render the ministrations of the pulpit powerless, by overtasking the ordinary intelligence, and dealing not in principles or results, but in the details by which they are reached—but is there any good thing that is not liable to be perverted? We admit, too, that there are some eminently gifted and pious men, who, without much mental acquisition, preach the Gospel with far greater effect than many others of a vastly higher order of intellectual culture—but this does not at all affect our general position in regard to the importance of a learned ministry. Learning, when rightly applied in the pulpit, simplifies, and illustrates, and removes obscurity instead of creating it. Few preachers have succeeded better in putting themselves into communion with the common mind, and we may add in enlightening and directing it, than *Archibald Alexander* and *Moses Stuart*; and yet the mind of each of them was, beyond almost any of their contemporaries, a vast treasury of biblical and theological knowledge.

Yet another of the Church's resources is to be found in her *pecuniary means*. The whole Christian enterprise, by which we mean the universal publication of the Gospel as preparatory to the universal triumph of the Church, necessarily involves vast expenditure. The men who preach

the Gospel must, according to the Apostle's doctrine, live by the Gospel; for if they devote themselves to their appropriate work, what shall sustain them if it be not the bounty of the Church? Then there are public churches, which, from a protracted suspension of the ordinances of the Gospel, seem almost on the point of extinction—these require to be helped, and cherished, and revived; and this cannot be done unless somebody contributes the means of doing it. There are extensive regions of our own country which are simply a spiritual desolation; where no churches have ever been established, and the Gospel has never been preached, unless at long intervals, by some passing missionary—here is another call for funds to sustain the heralds of salvation, who shall go thither, as the instruments, in God's hand, of making all things new. And, finally, there are the far-off dreary wastes of Paganism, and Mohammedanism, and Romanism, and other kindred systems of error, where Christianity has yet to plant her standard, and proclaim her heavenly truths, and perform her renovating work—but who does not see that a vast amount of silver and gold must be put in requisition before this mighty enterprise can be consummated? To sustain and keep in good working order the moral machinery of the Church that is in operation to-day, is a prodigiously expensive matter; and who will venture even to conjecture the amount that will be necessary to sustain her future benevolent operations, as they become gradually extended and intensified to compass the wants of the entire world? We say, then, money—however prolific of evil it becomes by perversion—is one of the divinely recognized means for spreading the Gospel through the world, and securing the Mediator's universal reign.

The last of the Church's resources that we shall notice, and that which constitutes the crown of all the rest, is *living, earnest piety*. You may blend all other means for advancing the interests of the Church in a common enterprise—you may put in requisition the finest intellects of the age, and as many of them as you can employ—you may command the most profound and critical and varied learning—you may draw without stint from the coffers of the rich—and yet, if, along with these various and necessary means, there be not a spirit of enlightened and active piety, a plentiful baptism of divine influence, the great work of extending and building up the Church can

never go on, and the reason is that this would be at best a mere self-righteous instrumentality, destitute of all vital energy, which God could neither approve nor bless. And you reach the same result if you look at this work in detail; for while nothing but the spirit of piety could be expected to bring into existence the various organizations on which the prosperity, not to say the existence, of the Church depends, nothing else could give them a right direction, nothing else could supply to them a living power. Suppose, for instance, the ministry of the Gospel to be exercised from mere worldly considerations, and without any recognition of dependence on Christ, even admitting the pure Gospel to be preached, what else could you expect than that that which never came from the heart would reach the heart, and that there would be at least as little faith in them who heard as in him who preached? What would a band of careless and worldly Sunday School teachers do towards guiding the youthful minds, committed to their care, in the ways of truth and holiness? What would become of the various benevolent institutions now in existence, and where would be the ground of hope that others would arise, accommodated to future exigencies, unless the former were to be sustained, and the latter originated, by a spirit of active piety? Without this, where would be that faith that brings Almighty Power to help our weakness? Where that vigorous, well-directed, persevering activity, that never falters in the presence of obstacles? Where that hearty co-operation in carrying forward good enterprises that has its origin in the fact that Christians are one in Christ? Where that hallowed inter-communion between earth and Heaven, through which the spirit of Heaven is conveyed to the Church on earth, by way of preparation for its immortal triumph? We repeat, the Church has no resources that are independent of a living piety. Other things are important, even indispensable, in connection with that; but without it they are as powerless to accomplish the desired result as an infant's breath would be to hush the tempest.

We have spoken of the resources of the Church—but on what ground, it may be asked, do they belong to her? Why, on the ground that they are committed to Christ as Mediator for her benefit, and He is pleased to employ them as the means of leading her on to her final triumph. She claims them then by the authority of her Head; and

there is no power on earth or in hell that can dispute her right to them, or that is adequate to wrest them from her.

But if such are her resources, what then are her *undeveloped* resources?

We answer, in the first place, they are those which, as yet have no actual existence, though it is within our power, by God's blessing, to create them. It does not, indeed, come within our province to bestow powers of intellect that have been withheld by the Creator; but we may be instrumental in cultivating, to an indefinite extent, those which the Creator has bestowed. There is to be found, even in the humblest walks of life, many a young man of naturally vigorous intellect, surrounded by influences, utterly adverse to anything like mental development, and perhaps there is nothing about him that betokens even an aspiration for learning; but let some benevolent individual, or the charity of the Church, take that youth in hand, and let him feel that there is a possibility of his being educated, and not improbably his whole soul will be fired with the ambition to become a scholar; and at no distant period he will have traversed the whole ground between an illiterate boy and a learned man—and why may not these acquisitions, by God's blessing, be appropriated for the benefit of the Church? A young man enters upon life deeply interested in the advancement of Christ's kingdom, and yet dependent upon his own efforts to earn his daily bread. But he will address himself industriously to the labors of some honest vocation, not merely that he may thereby provide for his temporal wants, but that he may be able to quicken the onward movements of the cause of truth and righteousness. He becomes possessed, perhaps, of what the world calls a large fortune—and this in respect to him is like a new creation. All around us, and whithersoever we go, there are persons who are strangers to the renewing power of the Holy Ghost, who, instead of being fellow-helpers together unto the kingdom of God, are mutual auxiliaries to each other's destruction—all these are susceptible of being born from above; of being moulded into the faithful servants of God, and the heirs of a heavenly life—and though a Divine agency is requisite to accomplish this result, yet it is the ordinance of God that, in all ordinary cases, a human instrumentality should be joined with it. In this last mentioned case, there is literally a new creation, requiring the

exercise of Divine power; and yet it is as legitimate a field for man to labor in, as if the work to be accomplished came within the range of his own unassisted ability.

We remark, again, the undeveloped resources of the Church are those *which exist without being recognized*. There are many men, especially young men, who are admirably qualified by nature, by grace, by training, to occupy important positions, perhaps in the Christian ministry, perhaps in the great field of evangelical benevolence, whose mature qualifications for these places have hitherto been overlooked, in consequence of which the measure of their usefulness has, to say the least, been greatly abridged. So, too, there is much wealth in the Church, that is now utterly useless as a means of its prosperity, that ought to be, that might be, rendered greatly tributary to its advancement. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, which every one knew might be consecrated to objects of Christian benevolence, without injustice to any body, would have remained as a ruinous legacy to children, but for the suggestion of some discreet friend, that the money would yield a better interest, if it were given directly to the Lord. Here again, the resources were in existence, but they had not till now been recognized in any such sense as to be rendered available.

We only add, under this article, that those resources of the Church *that exist and are recognized, but not applied*, may be said to be undeveloped. Every thing here is practical, and is to be judged entirely by the result which it accomplishes. Take, for instance, the case of a young man who has been educated, perhaps by the charity of the Church, for the Christian ministry—he becomes possessed of the requisite intellectual furniture, passes successfully through his appointed trials, and comes forth a regular accredited ambassador of God. But his mind becomes gradually drawn away from the duties of the ministry, and, at no distant period he has abandoned them altogether, and is in the vigorous prosecution of secular engagements. There are in that man's mind resources which are, to all intents and purposes, undeveloped, because unapplied. Take another case—a benevolent individual has made a bequest for some charitable object; but the sum bequeathed, instead of being judiciously applied in furtherance of that object, is suffered, from mistake, or oversight, or inattention, to remain utterly unproductive, when it might be, ought to be, as it was designed to be, employed as a benevolent minis-

istration. It cannot be considered as developed before it is applied to its legitimate purpose.

Our next general inquiry is, *How are the undeveloped resources of the Church to be developed?* The answer is, partly by a human, and partly by a Divine agency.

In illustration of the power, we may mention, first, *the Pulpit*, or the Divine ordinance of the preaching of the Gospel. This institution is designed to act upon two classes of persons, which, together, constitute the whole world, saints and sinners; and in either case its tendency is towards the result which we are now considering.

It accomplishes its legitimate effect upon the impenitent, the unforgiven, the unholy, by subduing their rebellion, and pacifying their consciences, and moulding them not only into the servants, but the children, of God. But in every case in which this effect is produced, there is a new instance of the development of a principle of piety, which, of necessity, converts its possessor into a pledged auxiliary to the great interests of the kingdom of Christ. The individual supposed may have his lot cast in a more public or a more private sphere, he may become a minister of the Gospel, or he may be called to preside over some department of benevolent action, or he may move in the humblest circle, and never even be heard of beyond the limits of his own neighborhood, but in each case he has his own field of active usefulness, and there is that within him that will ensure his occupancy of it.

And if such be the action of this Divine ordinance upon an ungodly world, gathering lively stones for the Heavenly Temple out of the wastes of spiritual death, what influence, in the way of developing the Church's resources does it exert upon those who have already enlisted under Christ's banner? In general it advances the work of their sanctification, purifying their spiritual discernment for the better understanding of their duty, and strengthening them with all might in the inner man for the more vigorous and faithful discharge of it. But more than this; it exhibits to them their duty in detail; in connection with their various relations, and in view of the diversity of circumstances in which Providence may place them; and it enforces the claims of duty alike upon all classes. It makes prominent the great truth that all our faculties, all our possessions, come from God, and are to be consecrated, in some way, to his service.

It illustrates the obligations of the rich to contribute of their abundance, and of all to give according as the Lord hath prospered them, in aid of the great work of evangelizing the world. It encourages the young to form habits of Christian activity, to seek positions of Christian usefulness, especially to make their influence felt in connection with the Sunday School, and if Providence opens the way into some wider and more prominent field of benevolent labor, to hold themselves ready to occupy that also. And to crown all, the teachings of the Pulpit are invested with a Divine authority—they are nothing less than God's own teachings—they come to us, claiming, by a Divine right, our attention and regard—and hence the power which they are fitted to exert, actually do exert, in revealing and bringing into active service, the resources which God has committed to the Church for her own extension.

Another part of man's agency in the accomplishment of this object is by the *Press*. The art of printing does for the eye what the ordinance of preaching does for the ear; except that mind acts upon mind with far greater power through the utterances of the living voice than through the medium of insensible types. Still the tract, the volume, above all, the Book of Books, may and often does find its way where the ministry of the Gospel has never been established; and it is quite supposable that it should convey the good seed into some mind where it would otherwise never have been lodged. But the Press and the Pulpit, instead of being regarded, each as an independent agency, should be looked upon as mutual auxiliaries of the same great cause, the Pulpit possessing the greater power, the Press taking the wider sweep. To say nothing here of the almost innumerable works which the Press is constantly pouring forth, designed to arouse the attention of the careless, or to illustrate Christian obligation, or purify and invigorate the inner life, we will advert only to the prodigious influence of the religious periodical press, especially as we witness its operation in our own country. Like all other good things it is, indeed, liable to perversion,—sometimes actually is perverted, to purposes of great evil; but still it is mighty to move the heart of the Church for good—it diffuses an enlightening, quickening, elevating influence far and wide. A single number of a well-conducted religious newspaper, who can estimate the amount of rich and varied blessing, of which it may prove the medium? It may

contain some appeal, condensed into a single sentence, that shall turn the conscience of the sinner into a minister of wrath, and urge him away to the Cross of Christ to get it sprinkled with atoning blood; or that shall fall with a mountain's weight upon the heart of some backslider Christian, and send him off to his closet to pray and weep. Or it may contain some suggestion that shall give to the heart of a young man, anxious to know his duty, a direction towards the Christian ministry, and be the means, ultimately, of bringing to that blessed work one who shall be the instrument of turning many to righteousness. Or it may contain some information in respect to the wants or woes of the world, or in respect to what has already been done to meet them, that shall set some Christian, whose eye rests upon it, to devising liberal things, in the train of which shall come light and blessing to some dark portion of the earth. Or it may contain some record of a revival of religion, that shall touch, as a fire from Heaven, some half-discouraged Christian, and thus not only mark a bright epoch in his own personal experience, but perhaps also make him the instrument of reproducing the same blessed state of things in his own neighborhood. The religious press is a power, mighty in developing the Church's resources.

So also much may be done to the same purpose by both the *individual and associate influence of members of the Church*. If individuals sometimes over-rate their personal influence, giving themselves credit for a measure of power over other minds that does not belong to them, it is not less true that they often under-rate it, and, in the strength of this false estimate, most unnecessarily circumscribe their own usefulness. It is not easy to fix a limit to what may be accomplished by one well-directed mind that is always upon the look out for opportunities of doing good. Yonder is a Christian missionary, in whose bosom is reproduced the spirit of David Brainerd or Henry Martyn; whose labors are fast changing the wilderness into a garden; and whose whole life is the testimony that he would shrink from no sacrifice, by means of which he might help forward the cause to which he is devoted—if you find out the history of that man, it will be something like this—a living, earnest, self-sacrificing Christian was attracted to him first by some exhibition of superior intellect; and then, by God's grace, he succeeded in changing the purpose of his life, and giving his affections an upward tendency; and then he bid him

quit the farm or the workshop, and, with a generous hand, dealt out to him the means of becoming trained for the sacred office—and in due time he was invested with it; and he chose his field of labor in the wilderness; and already many a wandering savage has been enlightened and saved through his instrumentality, and waits to shine forth as a gem, not only in *his* crown, but in the crown of his benefactor also. Yonder is a well-endowed and well conducted institution for training young men for the Christian ministry—hundreds, and it may be thousands, have passed through its prescribed course, and are scattered all over the land, all over the world, fulfilling their duties as the heralds of salvation—but that institution had its origin in the suggestion of a single mind; and though the influence of that mind was immediately seconded by that of other minds, and may perhaps speedily have been lost in the combined influence of a multitude, yet it will always remain true that it was the germ of the enterprize that gave to the Church one of its noblest institutions. Yonder is an Education Society, gathering the Church's bounty for the training of her sons; or a Missionary Society, taking them in charge, when they are trained, to do the Lord's work in heathen lands; or a Bible Society, whose business it is to dispense the written word to the wretched and destitute—but, here again, there is, or there has been, somewhere upon the earth, a mind in which this noble conception existed in solitary grandeur; and though no one now may be able to point to the individual, and say "Thou art the man," yet the day of revelation and retribution will at once show who he was, and measure out to him a glorious reward.

But if a member of the Church may do so much to develop its resources, in an individual capacity, what may not be expected from a well organized and well sustained effort on the part of many? Each of those combinations for purposes of good, to which we have just referred, as illustrative, in their origin, of the power of individual influence, becomes a fixed, and enduring, and mighty agency, for testing and developing the powers of the Church. And when united, and especially when considered in connection with the whole sisterhood of benevolent associations which the Church now embosoms, must not this agency possess an energy that transcends all human comprehension? Under its benign workings, talent finds its way out of its original obscurity; learning offers itself as the hand-maid of truth;

wealth shows a large heart, and opens a liberal hand; and piety, full of life, and love, and power, divides her time between the closet where she supplicates God's gracious help, and the world where she scatters her benefactions. Indeed we may consider the whole Church as one grand community engaged in revealing and applying her own resources; and the more united, and earnest, and faithful she is, the larger will be the treasures that she will reveal for the advancement of her prosperity.

But there is a *Divine* as well as human agency employed here—and it is two-fold,—the agency of *Providence* and of *Grace*.

God's *providence* is to be acknowledged in the ordering of our lot, no matter how much it may seem to be the result of our own devising. That youth just now referred to, as having been raised from obscurity, perhaps positive degradation, by the hand of Christian charity, and conducted by the same hand into a field of honorable usefulness, was all the time under the direction and care of God's gracious providence—it may have seemed an accident that he came under the eye of his earthly benefactor; but it was no accident—it was in perfect accordance with an arrangement made by Him, who guides the winged arrow, and directs the sparrow's fall. Not unfrequently affliction becomes, in this way, the minister of good—the darkest cloud discharges itself in a shower of the richest blessing. That man who is now doing valiant service for Christ, would never have entered on the Christian life, much less on the ministry of the Gospel, but for some fearful casualty that put his life in jeopardy, and brought him to serious reflection. That man who is now giving his hundreds of thousands in aid of the cause of Christ, received his first benevolent impulse on what he believed at the time was his death-bed, where he saw all his worldly treasures weighed in the balance and found wanting. The profligate sale of indulgences by Tetzel was necessary to enlighten the conscience and fire the heart, and nerve the arm of the great Luther, at whose bidding the accumulated darkness of centuries rolled back, and a light shone, revealing God's outstretched arm for the deliverance and purification of his Church. And who can doubt that, when the thick cloud that now rests upon the bosom of our own beloved country shall be lifted away, those terrible scenes in which nothing appears to human view but man fighting against man, the citizen in rebellion against his

government, the sword refusing to return to its scabbard because the whole land is not yet deluged with blood,—who can doubt, that this fearful procedure, in which the friends of darkness seem to be holding a jubilee, will be found to have had in it the elements of a grand purification; will be introductory to a brighter day for the Church than she has ever seen yet? And thus it is always—

“God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.”

His providence is always developing new resources for the Church, and just as certainly in the darkness and the storm as in the sunshine.

And He accomplishes this end by His *Spirit* no less than by his providence. In all those cases of moral renovation which we have already referred to a human instrumentality, God's Spirit is to be recognized in an infinitely higher sense—for in that alone dwells the power that turns the heart of stone into flesh. If you will behold the operations of this Divine Agent, in developing the resources of the Church, on a grand scale, contemplate an extensive revival of religion. First of all, you see new helpers in the great work of carrying up God's spiritual temple, multiplying around you; for each one upon whom God enstamps his image, becomes, in consequence of that act, a pledged laborer in the cause of human salvation. And besides, such a scene always brings with it a fresh baptism of spiritual influence to those who were previously enlisted in the good work, invigorating the weak and the weary, swelling the tide of Christian charity, and making all more vigilant to observe, and more diligent to improve, the opportunities for doing good. Wherever God's Spirit is copiously poured out, and religion extensively revived, there you may set it down as a fixed fact that the facilities for promoting religion will be greatly increased, and every movement in favor of truth and right will receive a higher and stronger impulse. Such then is the agency of man, and such the agency of God, by which the process of developing the resources of the Church has been, and is yet to be, sustained.

It only remains now to illustrate the obligation of the Church to see to it that this object is attained; that her resources are not only rendered available, but are actually applied to their legitimate purposes.

And our first remark here is, that this is necessary to the accomplishment of her own sublime mission. This is the specific work which God has committed to her; which He has not only required her to perform, but has rendered it certain, by his own ordination, that she will perform. He has placed in her keeping what may be regarded as the germ of her own final and eternal exaltation; and that germ is to unfold under her own watchful and fostering care. She has her part to perform in bringing into exercise all the appointed means of fulfilling the divine purposes, and thus educating herself for immortality, just as truly as if the providence and grace of God had nothing to do with the enterprise. To suppose that she should fail in this were to suppose nothing less than that she were recreant to her adorable Head; that she were a traitor to the great Captain of salvation; that she had abjured, at once her confidence in his wisdom and power, and her allegiance to his authority. She must and she will keep on in the truly loyal work of developing her own resources, and applying them to their legitimate ends, until her mission upon the earth is fully accomplished.

The Church is bound to this also from a regard to the perfection of her own character. It is a law which, so far as we know, pervades the whole intelligent creation, that improvement is consequent upon exercise; that the faculties, while they are working out noble results, are themselves strengthened and exalted by the very effort by which those results are attained. The mind of the philosopher, which has been struggling for years to solve some great problem of life, or to fix definitely some one of the creation's laws, has, on reaching a successful termination of its efforts, accomplished a double purpose—not only has it solved the problem or ascertained the law, but the very exercise by which it has done this, has re-acted as an invigorating influence upon its own powers. And this remark applies to the moral and spiritual as truly as the intellectual—let the will and affections be brought into exercise in favor of some good object,—for instance, the relief of some sufferer or the reclaiming of some wanderer, and besides the accomplishment of a worthy object, the very spirit of the man will acquire a fresh impulse towards all that is good. And thus it is with the whole Church—in developing her own resources, she brings into exercise her own energies, both intellectual and moral; and these energies rise and expand

and brighten in proportion as they are exerted; and thus her own character is always advancing from glory to glory.

Moreover, it is necessary to *the attainment of her allotted destiny* that the Church should develop her resources. The Israelites, on their march through the wilderness, and in their arrival in Canaan, strikingly typified the Church in her scene of labor and trial, and in her final entering into rest. God had ordained that his poor suffering people in Egypt should have a safe home at last in the fertile and beautiful land of Canaan; but they had much to do before this could be attained—they had to encounter the perils of a protracted journey through the wilderness; and though God provided them with the means of doing this, they were necessitated to keep their own faculties in constant exercise in obedience to the divine will. In like manner God has provided a glorious resting-place for his own ransomed Church; a place where the inhabitants shall no more say they are sick; where the light of the sun and the moon is not needed because the Lamb is the light thereof; and this is secured to her by the decree, the promise, the oath, of Jehovah. Still, she has her preparatory work to perform; and that work is nothing less than the development and application of her own resources in preparing her for the glorious destiny that awaits her in Heaven. Here on earth the Church sees through a glass darkly; she is oppressed by a sense of her own weakness and impurity; she is conscious of her unfitness to breathe a perfectly holy atmosphere, and mingle with perfectly holy beings in perfectly holy employments; but in the development of her own resources, she undergoes a baptism of suffering and of love, that qualifies her for her appointed destiny,—that of engaging in an everlasting ministration of praise around the throne.

And last of all, and above all, let the Church be faithful in this service we are contemplating, in view of the fact that *it is essential to the Mediator's final triumph*. The grand mediatorial undertaking,—that of gathering a Church from the ruins of the apostacy, of redeeming it by an infinite sacrifice, and presenting it without spot before the throne, to be an everlasting monument of the wisdom and power and grace of God,—this mighty enterprize, was committed to the Lord Jesus Christ. It has placed Him, from the beginning, in an antagonism with all the powers of evil; and between Him and them there has always been, and still is, a contest going forward, which sometimes vibrates to the

innermost heart both of the Church and of the world. But while He is the grand agent, the Church is the instrument which He employs in conducting this contest; and she performs her part in the use of those resources which He has placed at her command; and she cannot be neglectful in respect to these resources without not only trifling with her own best interests, but retarding his full triumph. Let the Church, then, as she loves and adores her gracious Redeemer, and as she would behold the mediatorial crown resting upon his head in full-orbed glory, labor with fresh zeal at her appropriate work of using all the means which He has placed within her reach or has given her the power to create, for consummating his purpose of redemption in respect to our world. And when the ransomed shall all be gathered in, how will thanksgivings flow from their lips to Him who hath redeemed them; and how will benedictions pour forth upon them from his throne, in consideration of the poor service which they will have been privileged and honored by his grace to render as preparatory to his complete mediatorial exaltation!

We shall not have gained our purpose in this train of remark, unless the effect of it shall be to quicken the sense of individual responsibility in reference to the great duty we have been urging. If we mistake not, the fact that almost every object, connected with the progress of Christ's kingdom, has some association pledged for its furtherance, including of course the creation, or the discovery, or the bringing into exercise, of all possible means of promoting its interests, renders it more than possible that those who are not connected with these societies, will imagine that there is nothing for them to do, while this vast associate agency is at work; and more than that,—there may be danger that even those, who constitute these societies, will relax individual effort, under the false idea that there is some mysterious power in combination that supersedes the necessity of it. It is, indeed, one of the brightest signs of the times that the Church has her representative associations in almost every department of the field of Christian benevolence; but it is not true that this fact neutralizes or lessens the obligations of any member to exert himself individually for the advancement of Christ's cause up to the full measure of his ability. Be it so that the Church looks first to her ministry for the development of her resources; but she can

do something in the person of every member,—for even he who has no access to the world, may still have access to God, and thus faith may move the hand that moves the planets. Let the ministry be more watchful, more earnest, more resolute, to reveal and appropriate all the resources which God has put within their reach. Let every private Christian look about him, and see at what point, or by what instrumentality, he can labor to the same end most successfully. Suppose you rescue from obscurity some brilliant or powerful mind, and put him in the way of being educated for the service of the Church, and the history of his life should turn out to be a history of well-nigh apostolic usefulness; or suppose you should touch some hitherto undiscovered spring of Christian charity, the effect of which should be, that fresh auxiliaries to the good cause should spring up, or some far off moral wilderness bud and blossom; or suppose you should put yourself into communion with some unregenerate and careless friend, and should be instrumental of leading him to Christ, and he, in turn, should be honored of God in originating and sustaining some great revival of religion, which should be the signal of a jubilee in Heaven as well as on earth—in either of these cases you will have accomplished a measure of good, and will have entitled yourself through grace to an amount of blessing, which exceeds the boldest powers of human comprehension. Again, we say, let every minister, let every Christian, not excepting even the obscurest and the weakest, come up fully, cheerfully, dependently, to this Heaven-appointed work. And let him, who has no heart to respond to this claim,—no matter how high a place in the Church he may occupy,—scrutinize afresh his own title to Heaven, lest what he thought was the signature of God's Spirit should prove to be the work of his own dreamy and deceiving imagination.

But we hear some one ask—What? Seek to develop the Church's resources at such a day as this, when every available energy that we can command is required to be put in exercise to save our bleeding country? We answer, Yes; for the force of the command of Zion's King does not depend upon circumstances; and no darkness can be so deep as to constitute the semblance of a ground for evading its obligation. Besides, are you quite sure that, in responding promptly, liberally, to the country's claims, you are not actually uncovering foundations of richest blessing to the Church; that

you are not doing that which it is absolutely necessary should be done before the American Church shall properly appreciate the varied sources of her power? But then comes another voice speaking in a tone of yet deeper discouragement, as if the terrible scenes of the hour were enough to weaken our confidence in respect to the future, so far at least as to throw into the distance events which we had hoped soon to realize. But what mean ye, O ye of little faith, by thus refusing to recognize God's hand in the stormy night as well as in the calm, bright day? At least be contented to hold your peace, while you are thus undergoing the baptism in the cloud; for the spirit which you evince is contagious, and wherever it exists, it is an element alike of weakness and of bitterness. Rise up, and gird yourselves with strength, all ye who profess to be the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. The darkness, in which you walk now, conceals from you the movings of the almighty and all-gracious arm; but they are not the less real, and by and by they will be made manifest. And then you will bow before the throne with admiring gratitude, in view of those very events, which now task your bleeding hearts to the utmost for the exercise of submission.

ARTICLE II.

M. FLACIUS ILLYRICUS AND HIS TIMES.

By CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

THE justice which history renders to eminent benefactors of mankind is sometimes tardy. When their lofty principles of honor and religion come in collision with the petty interests and selfish feelings of their contemporaries, the latter are prompted to employ in the struggle which succeeds, the weapons of falsehood and defamation. The noble aims of the former and their large views are, besides, often unintelligible to ordinary men of their age; these are, accordingly, even when uninfluenced by hostile motives, easily persuaded by designing or envious spirits to believe that there is evil in the purposes and acts of a man of towering intellectual

power, and to withhold their confidence; even when he is controlled by the purest and most sublime religious principles he cannot always escape reproach and misrepresentation. Succeeding writers who are either incapable of appreciating his character, or whose partisan feelings lead them in an opposite direction, are tempted to suppress all mention of his merits and to describe his human failings in the language of exaggeration. Any imprudence of which he may have been guilty, even when the motive was honorable, is contorted without equity or reason into a crime. Thus he appears to later ages in the shadow of a cloud, and truth and justice are repeatedly violated by those who unconsciously repeat the unfair statements of their predecessors. It is fortunate for such an individual when the essential facts of his history are discovered in long-lost documents which allow him to speak in his own defence, and when they are communicated to a generation which can survey him with calmness and impartiality.

The remarkable man who forms the subject of this article was a chosen instrument of the Lord in preserving the purity of the faith of the Lutheran Church at a most critical period; the latest generations will have reason to bless God for the great and abiding work which Flacius was called to perform. But he encountered in his day all the malice of popery; he was opposed by time-serving Protestants, and, to the anguish of his soul, he was rebuked for an error in one of his doctrinal statements with inexorable rigor by his stern Lutheran brethren, whom grace had enabled to renounce "father, mother, wife, children, brethren, sisters, yea, and their own life also" (Luke 14: 26), rather than prove unfaithful to Christ and his truth. Hence Flacius was condemned at different periods and for different reasons by writers of the most opposite sentiments. Church-historians of a later day have repeated many of these strictures; Planck of Göttingen, whose one-sided historical work* was at one time deemed to be impartial and sound, was too much influenced by Rationalistic tendencies to understand a character like that of Flacius. His perversions, were, therefore, long regarded as fair statements of facts or specimens of successful logical reasoning. It was the excellent Twisten of Berlin who in more recent times first exposed the falsity of the current statements respecting this much

*Geschichte d. Entstehung—d. prot. Lehrbegriffs, &c. 6 vols.

injured man, and paid a fitting tribute to his extraordinary merits.* At last a biographer was found in W. Preger, a professor in the royal Gymnasium of Munich, who with unwearied zeal searched various libraries in Germany, examined vast numbers of manuscripts, and then presented the results of his labors in a complete biographical account of Flacius.† To this work, as well as to Ranke‡ we are principally indebted for the following facts, some of which, relating to the personal history of Flacius, have probably not yet been placed before an English reader.

The Adriatic Sea is penetrated on the North by the Istrian Peninsula; on the Eastern coast of the latter a small city existed in the fifteenth century, and still remains, named Albona, 42 miles S. E. of Triest. Here Flacius was born, March 3, 1520. The whole region, after the separation of the Roman state into an Eastern and a Western Empire, belonged to the latter, and constituted an integral portion of the ancient *Illyricum Occidentale*, which is to be carefully distinguished from the præfecture called *Illyria Orientalis*, belonging to the Eastern Empire.§ While the republic of Venice was at the height of its power, it exercised sovereign authority over this region, and during its sway Flacius was born. His father's name was Vlacich, to which, according to the custom of the times he gave a Latinized form; he also adopted, in conformity to another usage, a geographical appellation, styling himself *Illyricus*. His baptismal certificate states that his mother belonged to a family of rank. The early death of his father did not prevent the boy from receiving a good education. After a due course of preparatory studies, he was sent to Venice for the purpose of completing his education. He was fortunately placed under the care of very able and distinguished teachers through whose judicious and faithful efforts his intellectual strength was rapidly developed and his mind furnished with rich stores of learning.

Flacius, as a youth, was studious and grave; he devoutly received the doctrines of the Romish Church as a Divine revelation, and the elements of truth which they contained

*In a lecture delivered in 1844, and afterwards printed with the title: *Matth. Flacius Illyricus*.

†The title is: *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, von Wilh. Preger, &c., 2 vols.

‡*Deutsche Gesch. im Zeitalter der Ref.* von L. Ranke, 5 vols.

§Koeppen: *The world in the Middle Ages*.

deeply affected his soul. He determined, like Luther, to enter a monastery in order that he might devote more time to the study of theology and become qualified to serve Christ in his Church. He accordingly sought one of his relatives named Baldus Lupetinus, a learned and devout man, who held the office of Provincial or director of several affiliated monasteries, and asked to be received as a lay-brother in a monastery of Venice, with the intention of subsequently attaching himself to the Minorites (Franciscans) in Padua or Bologna; as a compensation he offered to bestow at once the half of his paternal inheritance on the order. Lupetinus was a secret adherent of Luther; the penalty which he afterwards suffered, when detected, was an imprisonment of twenty years in a Venetian dungeon, at the close of which period he was drowned in the Adriatic. After having thoroughly examined his young kinsman he informed the latter that the true doctrine of the Gospel had been brought to light in Germany by Luther, furnished him with several of the books of the Reformer, and advised him not to enter a monastery but to seek out Luther.

Flacius, then in his nineteenth year, but eager to know divine truth, gratefully accepted this counsel and crossed the Alps, in opposition to the entreaties of his relatives, to whom he, too, like the disciple (Matt. 8: 21, 22), was commanded to relinquish the task of "burying their dead." When he reached Augsburg he was sent by an adherent of Zwingli to Basel. Here he was kindly received by the eminent Simon Grynaeus, and diligently pursued his studies. But his intercourse with Oswald Myconius (not Frederic Myconius or Mecum, Luther's friend), with the volatile Carlstadt and others, painfully affected him. He was isolated; his peace of mind was disturbed; his prayers seemed to lose their power. Deep agony of soul succeeded; the wrath of God terrified him, and he felt as if God had forsaken him. He could no longer remain in Basel, and left it after a residence of one year. In his discouragement of spirit he feared to approach the presence of Luther and Melancthon, and proceeded to Tübingen, where a countryman, an Illyrian named Garbitius, a professor of the Greek language in the re-organized University, gave him a temporary home. Here he both studied and replenished his exhausted funds by delivering lectures to the students; his personal character also secured for him the confidence and friendship of many eminent men. But the distress of his soul was not healed—he

could not find peace in God, and, at length, decided to proceed at once to Wittenberg, then the focus of light, the abode of Luther and Melancthon. His excellent testimonials immediately opened an avenue to Melancthon's confidence, under whose superintendence he resumed his studies and also gave instructions to various students in Greek and Hebrew. He temporarily experienced relief when he heard the words of truth from the lips of Luther and Melancthon. But his agony of soul soon returned and attracted the attention of a considerate friend who led him to Bugenhagen. This eminent man spoke words of consolation and offered prayer for him, but Flacius still desponded and could not hope for divine mercy. Then Bugenhagen conducted him to Luther, through whom God was pleased to convey light, peace and strength to a spirit that had long been exercised and prepared for deadly struggles in later years. Luther had experienced similar trials and temptations; he opened God's word to the fainting youth before him, revealed to him the grace of Christ, and unfolded the doctrine of Justification by faith. Both of these remarkable men were conducted by the same doctrine, after long and painful spiritual conflicts, to peace in God through Christ. A new light dawned on the troubled soul of Flacius; the crucified Redeemer appeared in a new and brighter form to him; the last mists of error were dispersed, and the doctrine of justification, as set forth by Luther, he now recognized as the pearl which he had so long and so ardently sought. He felt as if he had previously been cast down to hell—this precious doctrine raised him to near communion with God; he was endowed with new life and power, his soul was fully emancipated from popish bondage, the Spirit of God infused through the means of grace a living, mighty faith into his soul, and he consecrated himself, his life, his all, anew to God. After that eventful period of his life, he, too, like Luther, "stood fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made him free."

When he had attained his twenty-fourth year he received the appointment of professor of Hebrew; he was adequately supported, enjoyed the society of the Wittenberg Reformers, was married with Luther's approbation to a daughter of Michael Faustus, an aged and faithful pastor in Dabrun, began to furnish the learned world with valuable literary productions, and now passed the happiest period of his life. Such calm repose, undisturbed relations with all around him

and public and private enjoyments soon came to an end, and never returned. A contest—the *Interimistic* or *Adiaphoristic* Controversy—was at hand which agitated the Church during many years (commencing in 1548), and in which Flacius proved himself to be “a good soldier of Jesus Christ;” it appears as if God had specially raised him up at a period when Luther was to be removed, in order to be an instrument in securing the pure faith from destruction. Certainly, as far as the facts are presented on the page of history, we must judge that the Lutheran Church, after a brilliant rise and glorious but brief existence, would have been completely extinguished or re-absorbed by Popery, if Luther’s mantle had not fallen on Flacius. The hand of Divine Providence is here plainly seen. In order to present a clear, historic view of the subject, we must refer to an earlier period.

Maurice (Moritz), Duke of Saxony,* although a Lutheran, had, from political and selfish considerations, united his forces with the Emperor, Charles V.; the latter gained a decisive victory at Mühlberg, April 24, 1547, over the Elector of Saxony, John Frederic, the faithful friend of Luther and Protestantism, and then paid Maurice the stipulated “thirty pieces of silver” by investing him with the electoral dignity of his cousin and with nearly all the territories of the Ernestine branch of the Saxon princely house. Luther was already dead (died Feb. 18, 1546). Wittenberg, the cradle of the Lutheran faith, now belonged to the recreant Protestant Maurice. Melancthon retained his professorship under the new regime, and soon became a devoted adherent of his new master. He had not passed through those internal conflicts which Luther and Flacius had experienced, and, while he received the true faith with entire sincerity, his soul was never so powerfully roused as the souls of these two men, whose religious experience differed so widely from his own. Hence he could be deliberate when their hearts were swelling, and was in a higher

*Duke George, Luther’s old enemy, who died in 1539, was succeeded by his brother Henry; the latter, a Protestant in sentiment, at once allowed the work of the Reformation under Luther to proceed in his dominions. After his death in 1541, Maurice, his son, to whom only a moiety of ducal Saxony (belonging to the Albertine line) had been assigned, inherited the whole territory through the active and disinterested aid of his first cousin, John Frederic, the sovereign of electoral Saxony, and head of the senior or Ernestine line. Ranke IV. 114, 214.

degree disposed to survey divergent doctrines with indulgence. Some of the views of the Reformed presented attractive features to him; the showy and impressive forms of the popish worship possessed a certain charm in his eyes, as he himself remarks in the letter to which we shall presently advert; and, while he faithfully adhered to the doctrine of justification by faith, he could tolerate opinions which were really incompatible with it; for the sake of peace he could endure usages which his judgment condemned. In 1537 he was willing, for the sake of peace, to recognize the Pope as the Bishop of Christendom. In the same year he advised Schenk the court-preacher in Freiburg to sacrifice his convictions to the force of circumstances, and to administer the Lord's Supper only in one kind, that is, to withhold the cup. Such compliant tendencies on his part clouded the mind of Luther when he was near his grave; he fixed his hopes on Flacius in whom he discerned more of the robustness which the stormy age demanded, and was heard to say that *he* was the man on whom, after his own death, hope, when it began to decline, would lean for support.*

It is unquestionably true that Melancthon was severely reproached and condemned by many Protestants, during the later years of his life, for acts to which impartial history has given even a favorable interpretation. Still, our high appreciation of his distinguished merits ought not to invest his infirmities with an attractive character. After Luther's death, a certain feebleness of purpose was revealed in him, which had previously only been suspected. The ivy had reached a lofty position; but when the oak around which it twined, had fallen, it, too, descended to the ground. Historic truth records one act in the history of Melancthon—the only really humiliating act of his life—which, while it cannot extinguish a single ray of the glory in which he stands before us, nevertheless, so deeply wounded large numbers of Protestants, that even at this late day, we cannot wonder when we find them employing the language of stern rebuke. It was somewhat more than a year after Luther's death, that the battle of Mühlberg occurred. John Frederic, the Magnanimous, the nephew of Frederic, the Wise,

*Preger (I. 35) quotes from *Ulenberger vit. Flacii*, p. 376: "A fide dignis familiaribus Lutheri audire memini, tanquam genii sui hominem, illum (Flacium) summo loco habuisse, hunc fore ominatus, in quem se vita functo spes inclinata recumberet."

and son of John the Constant, was a prisoner of the emperor. Maurice took possession of the lands of his benefactor. A Protestant by name, Maurice was, in a far more emphatic sense, an ambitious, scheming politician; he had retained among his counsellors, when he inherited the duchy, a courtier named Christopher Carlowitz, an obsequious instrument of the emperor and the Catholic party, an old opponent of Luther,* and a relentless enemy of John Frederic and the Augsburg Confession.† It was already a painful experience to the Lutherans that Melanchthon, whom the sons of the captive elector desired to retain in their service, preferred to remain in Wittenberg as a subject of Maurice who had seized the patrimony of his benefactor's children. But nothing equalled the indignation which a subsequent act aroused, to which we have already referred. He wrote a letter to Carlowitz, dated April 28, 1548, of which the impartial Ranke says: "I could wish that he had never written it." (V. 60). The substance is furnished by Ranke, and by Salig (p. 615), but the original is more fully given by Preger (I. 40-42). Melanchthon, while writing to Luther's enemy, speaks of Luther, who is now in his grave, with harshness, and compares his own pacific character with the domineering spirit of which he accuses his deceased friend; while addressing a persecutor of John Frederic, who had been so indulgent, generous and faithful to Melanchthon, the latter allows himself to introduce unkind innuendoes respecting his fallen protector. So far, the language of Melanchthon, which, as Ranke says, was employed in "an unguarded moment," may be endured, if we exercise forbearance and view it as referring to private and personal matters. But the unfortunate letter, while it refused any change of doctrine and declined to admit the invocation of the saints, contained one passage, involving vital principles, which the ardent friends of truth could not easily forgive. It is the following: "I am also quite willing to adopt the ceremonies which the Augsburg Interim prescribes. * * * As a boy I already observed all the practices of the Church with special delight, and I am by my very nature an enemy of all that clownishness which cannot endure order in [ecclesiastical] acts, and which hates the common customs [of the Church] as it hates the dungeon." He then suggests to

*Ranke. IV. 314.

†Salig. Hist. der Augs. Conf. p. 566.

Carlowitz the policy of securing for the Interim the friendship of influential pastors, whose concurrence would promote its adoption by the Protestants of other German States. Even Carlowitz was amazed on reading the letter; the concessions which the writer made, were invaluable. He triumphantly exhibited it to all who desired to see it, and furnished numerous copies. The letter was of high political as well as doctrinal importance; copies were sent home by the ambassadors of other States, and when the emperor read it, he said: "Now you have Melancthon; see to it that you hold him fast." (Ranke V. 61.)

Before we state the facts which gave such significance to this letter, we may remark that it cannot for one moment be supposed that Melancthon was at this or any other time really guilty of a "leaning to popery." We may here apply the same principles of solution which the eminent Church-historian Lindner introduces in a somewhat parallel case. He assigns several weighty reasons in support of his opinion that Melancthon never actually changed his original Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper (including the *oralis manducatio*), and explains the homage which he was in his later years accused of offering to Calvin's theory, not as an actual departure from his earlier doctrine in any essential point, but simply as a suppression of his personal opinions for the sake of forming a closer union with the Reformed, "Er war Unionsmann," says Lindner.*

*Kirchengesch. III. B. 64. This view disposes at once of the absurd fiction of Heppel of Marburg respecting the "Melancthonian Church." The truth appears to be that Ebrard and his feeble party have no more right to claim Melancthon as their own than the Catholics would possess if they should prefer the same claim, founded on his course in the affair of the Leipzig Interim. His doctrinal convictions were not essentially altered, but he sighed for peace and union. His mistake was that which many other good men have since made, in overlooking the fact that no "union" can have value or permanence which is simply external and mechanical. When the "Evangelical Alliance," first started into life, its tremendous powers of deglutition would have led to the absorption even of the Universalists, if the Americans who assisted at the partition had not interposed. A healthy process of concoction could not be expected from the heterogeneous materials of the repast. Thus, the last number of the "Amer. Presbyt. and Theol. Review" (April, 1863) presents an article with the ominous title: "*Freedom betrayed by the Evangelical Alliance of England.*" The "moral monstrosities" of its periodical: The *Evangelical Christendom*, and the speeches of its once lauded President, Sir Culling Eardley, show that its politics have prevailed over its religion, and the apprehension is entertained that it is fast becoming a thing to

At this period the great public work for which Providence had trained Flacius commenced; his relations with Melanchthon and the importance of the letter to Carlowitz cannot be correctly understood unless the great events which at the time agitated the Church and the State, and which were connected with the famous Augsburg Interim are carefully considered. In the year 1547 death had relieved Charles V. of two powerful rivals, Henry VIII. of England, and Francis I. of France, whose threatening attitude had previously allowed him no repose; he now resumed his favorite plan of restoring the imperial throne of Germany to the proud position which it occupied in the days of Charlemagne. The sessions of the Council of Trent, which had commenced in 1545, had not yielded the fruits which the emperor had expected—the virtual acknowledgment that he held the right of a suzerain of the pope. His fears respecting a Turkish invasion were now lulled, and the military resources of the Protestants were no longer deemed essential to the stability of his throne. He had gained the battle of Mühlberg, seized the person of John Frederic, the leading Lutheran prince, and, soon afterwards, secured by a treacherous act, the person of Philip of Hesse; the Protestant or Smalcaldic Alliance was totally destroyed. Maurice and Joachim II. of Brandenburg, the two remaining leaders of the Protestants, were both influenced by personal and political considerations which made them pliable instruments of the emperor, and the latter now took a decisive step. If his project of rising to the summit of political and ecclesiastical power was to succeed, it was indispensable that no schism should remain in his German dominions. He accordingly determined, by persuasion or by force, to re-unite the Protestants and the Papists, by extorting the necessary concessions from each party. His own sagacity had long since convinced him that unless Popery reformed some of its worst vices, no union could be permanent; he still hoped that the acquiescence of the two discordant parties would be secured in so far, at least, as to enable him to accomplish his ulterior designs. King Ferdinand, his brother, receives in history the credit of having suggested that, as, on the one hand, the Protestants could not be extirpated, and, on the other, the Council of Trent was not regulated honestly and

be disowned and scorned.—There *can* be no "union" among men until they have first become "one in Christ." Any other religious union is as unsubstantial as a phantom that flees from the light of day.

uprightly by the Pope, it would be wise to adopt a temporary system of rules for the guidance of all parties, until unanimity could be officially obtained. The emperor adopted the suggestion, and such a document was prepared determining points respecting doctrines and Church usages on which Catholics and Protestants differed in sentiment; it was sanctioned by the emperor, and promulgated, May 15, 1548, with all the authority of a law of the empire. As the provisions of this instrument (the *Formula ad interim*) were officially declared to be in force only during the *interim* or intermediate time between its publication and a final decision by the Council of Trent, it was called from the city in which it was proclaimed: *The Augsburg Interim*. The authors were three in number; two Catholic bishops, Pflug, who represented the Erasmian Romanists, and Helding who acted for the more rigid Romanists; the third, representing the Protestants, was Agricola, a weak, vain man, the court-preacher of Joachim II. This prince was a Lutheran by profession, but his vain love of pomp and display had induced him to tolerate the showy forms of the Romish mode of worship. Luther had conferred many favors on Agricola (Islebius), but afterwards disowned him when he introduced his Antinomian heresy; the vast influence of Luther suppressed this dangerous error, and Agricola recanted outwardly; but his subsequent conduct showed that he remained unsound in the faith to his end. In the preparation of the Interim, he was scarcely consulted, as Ranke thinks, and his name, as that of a Protestant, was all that he furnished. His whole conduct is consistent with the anecdote of the handsome bribes by which Charles and Ferdinand secured his compliance.

The Augsburg Interim professedly conceded to the Protestants the temporary use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, as well as the marriage of priests, and, apparently, did not reject the cardinal doctrine of justification, but the terms in which the latter was expressed, involved popish or Pelagian views. The chief errors of popery were retained:—the Mass, viewed as a *sacrifice*; the pope, as the head of the Church; *seven* sacraments; the invocation of the virgin Mary and the saints; the pomp of processions, and all the parade of public worship. The Catholics claimed that the Interim did not affect them, and was intended only for the Protestants. At this point of time the purity of the faith was exposed to imminent hazard; if that Formula should be

sanctioned and prevail among Protestants, then Luther would have lived in vain, the light of Gospel truth would have been completely extinguished, and Popery would ultimately have been re-established with augmented and, indeed, invincible power. Joachim was favorably disposed and consented to conform to the Interim in his dominions; the Palatinate, although in the Protestant interest, also offered no opposition. Maurice was embarrassed, as he had previously given solemn pledges to his people of his determination to protect the Protestant Church; he declined to adopt the Interim at once, but assured the emperor that he would employ all his influence to secure its recognition by his Lutheran subjects.

The Interim was received by all faithful men with one loud cry of horror and execration. Southern Germany, which was overrun with Spanish imperial troops, was forced to adopt it, and 400 Lutheran pastors, including John Brenz, were driven into exile for non-conformity; the popish Mass was celebrated again in the churches, and the restored authority of the pope officially announced. The subordinate Lutheran princes were intimidated and prepared to yield; every opponent of the Interim who could be seized, was cruelly punished, and Satan's triumph seemed to be complete. *Two men*, the imprisoned John Frederic, who repelled the Interim with scorn, to the grief of Charles (who well knew the effect of his example), and *Flacius*, were chosen by the Lord as the instruments by which Satan's device should ultimately meet with a shameful defeat.

When Melancthon first read the Interim he was shocked, and even the remonstrances of his friend Carlowitz could not overcome the horror with which he surveyed the proposition that was placed before him, of apostatizing from the truth. At length the entreaties and wily expostulations of Maurice so far prevailed that an intermediate course was chosen. Melancthon, who loved peace and looked with terror on the persecutions which non-conforming Lutherans in other German territories were suffering, was persuaded to regard various popish usages and ceremonies as merely *Adiaphora*, that is, *things indifferent*, not involving matters of principle. He and his Wittenberg colleagues (Paul Eber, George Major &c.) first oppose, then re-examine, then alter, then recognize the Interim in its modified form.

After numerous consultations they meet in Leipzig and adopt certain articles which constitute the *Leipzig Interim*. That *all* the abuses of popery should be restored, even Maurice could not expect. But he urged that if these abuses could be partly rejected, partly receive a milder interpretation, then, possibly, an arrangement might be effected. Here the *adiaphoristic* principle assumed importance. Melancthon was placed in a cruel position. He was a sincere Protestant, but, alarmed as he was by the persecutions in Southern Germany, he was ready to adopt any appropriate means which would shield Saxony from similar afflictions. Might not these popish ceremonies, such as Extreme Unction, Confirmation by the bishop exclusively, with the chrism or holy oil, the ceremonies of the Romish Mass, the wearing of an alba or the change of sacerdotal vestments at the communion, be regarded as simply *adiaphora* to which no moral character for good or evil belonged? Might not the ringing of the little bell, Latin hymns and other forms connected with the Mass, be resumed as harmless changes? And was not Extreme Unction only a thing indifferent? What was the celebration of the festival of *Corpus Christi*,* unless a mere form, an *adiaphoron*? And if the term "alone" (*sola*) in Luther's favorite formula: "Justification by faith alone" should be dropped, did such omission positively declare that the Catholic doctrine of justification by human works was scriptural?

Such considerations, enforced by the stress of the times, and by a morbid desire for union, influenced the Wittenberg theologians when they adopted at Leipzig a modification of the 26 articles of the Augsburg Interim; this modified form received its name from the city in which the last meeting was held. Melancthon, who was aware (Preger I. 50) that political intrigue, regardless of the truth of God, only desired the weight of his name, was little satisfied with his own

* *Festum Corporis Christi, Frohnleichnamfest*, established in honor of the popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and assigned to the Thursday succeeding Trinity Sunday. The Council of Trent adopted the following: "The holy Council declares that the custom of annually celebrating this pre-eminent and adorable sacrament with *peculiar veneration* and solemnity on an appointed festal day, carrying it reverently and honorably in *procession through the streets and public places* was piously and religiously introduced into the Church of God." Cramp: *Text Book of Popery*, p. 176. "It was celebrated as the triumphal festival of the Catholic faith." Alt: *Cultus* II. 58.

course, and, as usual, regretted his concessions when the results appeared. These concessions were such as the following: The doctrine of justification by faith created more difficulty than any other, as, on the one hand, Melanchthon was not prepared to abandon its essential features, and, on the other, Maurice could hope for no gracious audience with the emperor on presenting his modification of the original instrument, unless he could demonstrate that Catholic theologians had given it their approbation. He actually induced two bishops, Pflug and Maltiz, to give their sanction to the new articles, after they had inserted certain expressions which aided a Catholic interpretation of the whole. The word *sola* in the usual Lutheran phrase *fide sola* (i. e. Justification by faith alone, to the exclusion of human works and merit) was *expressively* omitted; it was admitted that the Christian virtues of the believer, including his faith and good works, might be termed his righteousness,* and that such virtues were *necessary* to salvation. The exceptions and explanations of Melanchthon, although intended to maintain the spirit of the Gospel doctrine, still permitted the implication that man was not justified *solely* by the merits of Christ. The Catholics, who confounded justification and sanctification secured this gross error also by the insertion of their technical term: *justitia infusa*. The doctrine of faith was again abandoned in the statement respecting Penitence and the Sacraments generally, with regard to which the Interim consented to suppress all mention of the necessity of faith. For the sake of facilitating a future re-union with the Catholic Church, Melanchthon now practically availed himself of his theory that it was proper, provided sound doctrine was not affected, to regard all ceremonies, the ecclesiastical organization, &c., as adiaphora; Zwingli's radicalism, which proceeded to the other extreme, he termed "Swiss barbarism" (Lindner. III. B. 48). It was accordingly decided that the Lutheran reformation of the doctrine should not be abandoned, but that the Lutheran reformation of popish *usages* should be partially retracted. The Leipzig Interim, therefore, admitted the popish ordination of priests by bishops as alone in order, acknowledged Extreme Unction, Confirmation, &c., with the attendant ceremonies, restored the changes of vestments usual at the Mass, approved of solitary

*The original has it: *Virtutes etiam et bona opera in talibus reconciliatis justitia* (righteousness) *appellantur*, &c.—But St. Paul says: "If by grace, then it is no more of works, &c." Rom. 11 - 6.

masses which the Lutherans had been rightly taught to regard as a profanation, consented that the Mass should be received as a eucharistic sacrifice, and restored the primacy of the pope, the jurisdiction of the bishops and the right of the Church to dictate the correct interpretation of Scripture. After these enormous concessions were made, which in truth abandoned nearly all the vital principles of Lutheranism, the theologians imply that such admissions may indeed be dangerous, but that it would be better to endure a minor evil than expose the Church to persecution and ruin, soothingly adding that "it would be well, for the sake of peace, to submit to a certain form of bondage, when only things indifferent are concerned" (*servituten aliquam in adiaphoris esse tolerandam*). Still, "when the theologians looked at their work," says Ranke (V. 65), "they were themselves confounded, and complained that, while they had allowed themselves to be led to such extremes, they had been overwhelmed by the opinions of the rulers."*

The controversy that followed has received the names both of *Interimistic* and *Adiaphoristic* from the terms mentioned above. As no Lutheran military power now existed which could effectually sustain the Lutheran Reformation when a wide avenue for the return of Popery in its worst spirit had been opened, the cause of truth seemed to be hopelessly prostrated. Then God taught men that the Gospel can be sustained by *His* unaided power and needed neither prince nor theologian of great power and fame in restoring it to its supremacy. The silent influence of the captive John Frederic powerfully sustained the drooping hopes of many believers. But Flacius, the Illyrian, a stranger in Germany, without money or political influence, was chosen as the chief instrument of God in effecting his holy purposes. In this struggle, in which the pope, the emperor and leading Protestant princes and theologians seemed to forget their many diverging private interests in order to form one united, colossal power, God again "chose the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty."

*The tidings which Calvin received of these proceedings induced him to address Melancthon in the following terms: Plures tu unus paululum cedendo querimonias et gemitus excitasti, quam centum mediocres aperta defectione. (Ranke. V. 68). But it is said that Calvin afterwards remarked that exaggerated statements had produced a wrong impression on his mind at the time when he wrote.

Flacius at the present period occupied a subordinate position as a teacher in Wittenberg, but his whole soul was moved by these proceedings. He had loved and revered Melancthon, but divine truth, to which he owed all his peace and his hopes, was unspeakably precious to him. Besides, his oath of office, taken when he commenced his duties in Wittenberg, bound him to defend God's truth; the work which Luther had, with God's blessing commenced, could not be abandoned, and Antichrist be permitted to resume his sway. After fruitless endeavors to withdraw Melancthon from the snares in which he had become involved, he promptly sacrificed all for Christ and withdrew voluntarily from Wittenberg, before the popish forms were re-introduced, leaving his family behind. He found congenial spirits in Magdeburg, (where Luther's old friend Amsdorf occupied a high position), as well as in Lunenburg, Hamburg and elsewhere, and was cheered by the discovery that the Lord's "seven thousand in Israel" (1 Kings 19: 18) still lived. He finally chose Magdeburg as his residence where the imperial censorship of the press could not prevail, and he earned his bread by rendering temporary services in a printing office. As large numbers of faithful but helpless Lutherans urged him to espouse the cause of truth personally, he continued the publication of numerous writings which his prolific pen had already produced in Wittenberg. He exposed the threatening dangers of the Interim with uncommon acumen and unsparing rigor. It taught men—he alleged—to rely on their works for salvation, thus robbing Christ of all glory; it did not require faith in the communicant; it implied the rightful character of popish "Indulgences;" it converted Confirmation, a rite of human origin, into a means of grace, and it subjected all Lutheran pastors to the authority of the Bishops, to the complete overthrow of the whole Lutheran Reformation.

Flacius admitted unequivocally that *adiaphora* existed, and furnishes in one of his works* a lucid exhibition of their nature. He shows from 1 Cor. ch. 7; ch. 8; ch. 9; ch. 10; ch. 14, that Paul regarded the act of marrying, the use of certain articles of food, the observance of certain days, the acceptance by a teacher of a compensation, and the alternation of teaching and singing at public worship, as all being *adiaphora* ("non essentials"), or things in which the

*De veris et falsis adiaphoris. Magdeb. 1549; in the next year a German translation appeared.

decision of the individual is not sinful, provided that unchaste, superstitious or other unholy motives do not control the decision. Ecclesiastical adiaphora, in particular, are all the circumstances attending the public worship and the administration of the Sacraments, with regard to which the divine and holy Head of the Church has given no specific directions, save that all should be done decently and in order. Hence, the particular garments of the officiating minister, the place, the time, the choice of the hymns and tunes, &c., are adiaphora. Hence, too, it was unwise and sinful when controversies arose on points of such unimportance, as, whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used in the Lord's Supper. But when—continues Flacius—such adiaphora are specially chosen or sanctioned by the Church and tend to edification, no other than very grave reasons would justify the individual in departing from such Church order. It is of no consequence whether we observe the Christian festival of Easter precisely on the day when the Jews observe the Passover [probably an allusion to the decision in A. D. 325 of the Quartodecimanian controversy], but when the Church has once designated the time, no individual ought to introduce disturbances by insisting unnecessarily on a change. The whole extended discussion of Flacius is admirable in spirit and in execution; he grants the largest possible liberty to the private individual in things indifferent, but by numerous arguments and illustrations shows from a combination of several texts that *three* principles are here to be inviolably observed: first, that Christian “order” be not disturbed; secondly, that Christian “decency” be inflexibly maintained; and, thirdly, that Christian “edification” be ever regarded as an ultimate object in choosing among things indifferent. We regret that our space will not admit of liberal extracts.

In another work* Flacius defends the thesis: *That, in the present times, no change at all in religion* (usages or ceremonies, as well as doctrines) *ought to be made for the purpose of gratifying evil men.* Here he shows that the Papists would regard every concession as the payment of a portion of the heavy debt which the Lutherans, as the other party assumed, owed them for having once revolted, while feeble Christians would be grieved and offended. “And to please whom,” he indignantly asks, “is this course taken,

*The title is: *Quod hec tempore nulla penitus mutatio in religione in gratiam impiorum sit facienda.*

which wounds the consciences of devout men? Solely to please Antichrist, whom all men ought to shun." The fundamental principle which he now adopts is: *Nothing may be regarded as an adiaphoron, which concerns our confession of faith, and occasions scandals in the Church.**** Accordingly, the adiaphora of the Leipzig Interim are "ungodly adiaphora," in view both of the circumstances under which they are defined, and also of the motives which lead to their establishment. For they are really imposed by those against whom the Holy Spirit has warned all Christians, namely, by Antichrist, or the Babylonian harlot and the beast that carrieth her (Rev. 17: 1-7; 19: 2). Do not all these concessions proceed from a servile desire to gratify the princes? Are the latter not governed, in their turn, by a selfish desire to gratify the emperor and the pope? But are these two men controlled by a pure desire to obey Christ and honor the Gospel? The Church may, indeed, suffer persecution and bondage, and bleed at every pore. But is she ever permitted to renounce the liberty with which her Founder endowed her? Shall we make concessions to the enemy for the sake of peace, and thus take our case into our own hands? Has the heavenly protector of the Church lost his power, so that she is abandoned to her own resources? If other territories are now invaded by Papists, do we hope to protect Saxony by servility and cowardice? Are these the weapons that will hinder the Romans—the Papists—from coming and taking away both our place and nation (John 11: 48)? Satan and his handmaid, the world,—Flacius proceeds—are not satisfied with trifles; the Adiaphorists will soon be compelled to make a second series of concessions, and another, until the last seed of Gospel truth is annihilated. The profound and sagacious mind of Flacius then unveils the unwise policy of Maurice and Melancthon. Even if a living faith in God's truth and power did not encourage them, Flacius thinks that their own personal knowledge of the unscrupulous character of the emperor and of the bigotry of the Catholics should have taught them that any moderate concessions were worse than futile; the thirsty beast is eager for a second, and a third taste of human blood. Let those broad lines of demarcation which Luther established, once be effaced, and popish artifices will soon reconquer the whole territory that truth had won. Let it not be said

*Nihil est adiaphoron in casu confessionis et scandali.

that these are adiaphora in the sight of God ; even if some of them were originally harmless, they have since become vicious aids to idolatry ; hence they should be as inflexibly repelled as the devout Hezekiah brake the brazen serpent in pieces, which had once been raised on high by divine command, but had now become an object of idolatrous worship (2 Kings 18 : 4). On this account Flacius regarded the use of the white surplice (Chorhemd), the resumption of which the Interim conceded, although harmless in itself, as involving, under the circumstances, the sacrifice of a Protestant principle.

Flacius refers, in other writings, to the disastrous effects of auricular confession, to the fatal errors of the Catholics in regarding the external attendance on the Mass as all-sufficient, to the unprofitable character of the popish worship, which was still conducted in a language, (the Latin), which the people no longer understood, and to the abomination of regarding the mass as a sacrifice. All these pernicious practices now threaten to overwhelm Lutheranism as with a flood. He introduces the following illustration:—If any one assails me and says : “You have stolen from me one hundred pieces of gold ; return them at once, or I will employ compulsion,”—and, if I now pay him at one time ten, at another, twenty pieces, do I not practically confess the crime, no matter what other reasons for my conduct I may allege ? When we, in an analogous manner, make concessions to the Papists in the adiaphora, do we not confess thereby that our whole Lutheran Reformation was a crime ? The circumstances may be so unfavorable that an adiaphoron ceases to be an adiaphoron. It was certainly a thing indifferent whether Daniel prayed to God daily with the windows of his chamber open or closed ; but when the ungodly decree of Darius prohibited that act, any deviation from his practice of praying with *open* windows would have discouraged the faithful, and have been a tacit approbation of idolatry, if not a denial of the true God ; hence the practice, under the circumstances, ceased to be an adiaphoron. (Dan. 6 : 10). It was, according to St. Paul (1 Cor. ch. 8), an adiaphoron when an intelligent Christian partook of meat that had previously been offered to an idol, but the act ceased to be an adiaphoron when it caused a weak brother to perish. “All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient.” (1 Cor. 10 : 53). It was an adiaphoron to eat bread with washed or unwashed hands ; the Saviour,

however, purposely adopted the latter course in order not to connive at the sinful tenets of the Pharisees by apparently sanctioning them in his own practice (Matt. 15: 20; Mark 7: 2-13).

Flacius next establishes the principle: *That among the adiaphora which are now proposed to us, there are many which by their very nature are acts of impiety.** He re-examines the whole subject from this point of view. Our theologians—he says—first dropped the word *sola*; then they consented that believers became righteous chiefly through Christ; then they received the tenet that *our other virtues* are necessary as coefficients of our salvation. All their explanations and saving clauses are inoperative when they once abandon the word *sola*, that is, justified by Christ alone. They subject our Lutheran pastors to the Catholic bishops, but loudly protest that the latter must fulfil the duties of their office according to God's command. Why—he asks—who ever heard that any popish bishop, even when he committed the most infamous acts, claimed that he acted *in opposition to God's will*? Of course, all their tyranny, when we once submit to it, will be called by them *conformity to the Divine will*. Does the Interim concede that popish bishops alone shall ordain our pastors? A little child can see that, in this case, faithful men will be set aside, and our congregations be supplied only with Adiaphorists, Interimists and Papists. The Interim receives the popish doctrine respecting penitence, confession and absolution; it desires that the people should be exhorted to pray, fast and give alms, but nothing is said of the importance and value of *faith* which the Lutheran system regards as indispensable. Accordingly, our people will now be directed by the priest to repeat the Lord's Prayer with the lips and the Ave Maria* with the assistance of the rosary or beads, to fast twice a week, to pay for a Mass or two, and then to believe that all sin is pardoned and every religious duty fulfilled. What becomes of the religion of the heart or of faith? What becomes of Christ?

*Quod in præsentibus adiaphoris multa sint sua natura impia.

†This prayer adds to the words of the two salutations in Luke 1: 28, 42. the following: "Holy Mary, mother of God! Pray for us sinners now, and in the hour of our death. Amen." The Wittenberg theologians did not even remotely sanction such Mariolatry, but Flacius apprehends that it would soon glide into the Church under the cover of apparently harmless adiaphora.

We have not room to refer to all the dangers to which the warning voice of Flacius directs attention. The restoration of the old forms of the Mass would exclude the German hymns and substitute Latin words; the Confiteor (confession) would necessarily re-introduce the invocation of the saints; the canonical hours, which were also to be restored, could not fail to revive in the bosom of the Lutheran Church a host of exploded errors and superstitions, as well as sanction anew the doctrine of Purgatory, the gold mine of the priests. Among the abolished festivals which were to be restored, Flacius regarded with special horror that of Corpus Christi mentioned above, while he also discarded the additional Mary-days which only tended to foster a spirit of superstition and idolatry.

Flacius also refers to the different spirit which breathed in Luther. The latter thus wrote to Melancthon in the critical year 1530: "You entertain serious fears in reference to our cause, but my mind is quite easy on the subject, as I know that it is the cause of Christ and God. I feel like a mere spectator and am not alarmed by these ferocious and threatening Papists. * * Be it so that our cause must fail. I would rather fall with Christ than stand with the emperor." (The whole letter from which Flacius quotes and the others which he published, may be found in de Wette's collection: *Luther's Briefe*; for the one just mentioned, see Vol. IV. 62) "I am altogether dissatisfied with these transactions concerning an agreement in doctrine, which is clearly impossible unless the pope consents to abolish his papacy" (ib. p. 147). "I hear that you intend to make various concessions for the sake of peace. Now, if you concede the private Mass, that is enough—you then deny our faith and acknowledge their own. I am almost bursting with indignation. Cease to treat with them, *and come home!*" (Luther to Justus Jonas, Sept. 20, 1530. *ibid.* p. 159).

The immediate effects of these several publications of Flacius were decisive. He and his indefatigable associates in Magdeburg roused the Protestant feelings of believers so thoroughly in Maurice's dominions, that the latter, who was influenced chiefly by political motives, was successfully arrested in his unprincipled career. His sagacity taught him that if he persisted in his efforts to introduce the Interim in any form which would satisfy the emperor, his subjects, driven to desperation, would forcibly resist. Ma-

jor, in a letter to Duke Albert of Prussia, written in 1550, admits that the Magdeburg writers have robbed him of all hope of seeing the Interim established, and the Wittenberg theologians in the Vindication of their conduct published in 1559* concede that Flacius had been the great obstacle encountered by Maurice in executing his plan of *yielding to the Emperor in all things*, as far as piety and a good conscience would allow (*illud Principis Mauricii consilium impediit, quo decreverat, ut in omnibus, in quibus pie et cum bona conscientia posset, Cæsari obsequeretur*).

General history has recorded the leading fact that after Maurice had long seemed to be a faithful vassal of Charles V., and had, in his zeal for the latter even taken up arms against his Lutheran brethren, he suddenly assumed the attitude of a public enemy of the emperor. He issued a proclamation in which he harshly inveighed against his imperial master and declared that he would no longer permit "the priests (*Pfaffen*, for which, as a contemptuous term, we have no English equivalent) and the Spaniards to trample on him." On the 4th of April, 1552, he entered the imperial city of Augsburg with a large army, hastened to Innsbruck where the unsuspecting emperor lodged at the time without any considerable military force, and, if his own progress had not been temporarily checked by a mutiny among his troops who demanded their pay, he would have captured the emperor. The latter hurriedly fled late at night with a few attendants, overwhelmed with grief and mortification. The "fathers" who attended the Council of Trent, dispersed in dismay. The emperor, completely entangled in the toils of Maurice, was compelled to accede to the terms of the Convention of Passau (Aug. 2, 1552), which secured the adherents of the Confession of Augsburg from further molestation. This treaty was followed by the celebrated Peace of Augsburg concluded at the diet which was opened Feb. 5, 1555. The articles which, after various reciprocal concessions, were here adopted by the contending parties and publicly proclaimed September 25, were intended to secure for all future times the religious rights and liberties of the Lutheran Church in the empire.*

**Expositio eorum, quæ theol. Acad. Wittenberg, etc.* This statement, which furnishes nearly all the important documents referring to the controverted points, possesses great historical value, and is largely quoted by writers on the subject.

†Later events revealed many imperfections in the terms of the peace, which had a very unhappy influence, such as the exclusion of the

This extraordinary revolution in the conduct of Maurice is usually explained by historians on the general theory that he was at heart a Protestant, and that he was, besides, irritated by the emperor's obstinate refusal to liberate his father-in-law, Philip of Hesse. Later and more thorough investigations seem to unfold the policy of Maurice with more success. If he could have secured the tame submission of his Lutheran subjects and established the Leipzig Interim peaceably, the emperor and the Catholic party would, in view of the ultimate effects of that instrument and the expected decision of the Council of Trent, have been well contented. In that case it would have been folly to seek a collision with the mighty emperor. But the resistance of his subjects, which now assumed a very grave character, and for which, under God, later generations owe a vast debt of gratitude to Flacius, necessarily directed his scheming mind in another channel. That he could quietly retain the electorate, and, at the same time, live in the sun-shine of imperial favor, was now obviously impossible. On the other hand, the military power of the Protestants, if properly combined and subjected to one mind, could doubtless maintain itself permanently against that of the Papists, if the cause of the latter should at once receive a decisive blow. He seems to have at this juncture contrived the plan which he actually executed with inimitable skill; no lofty principle taught him to refrain from emulating the emperor in duplicity. His plan involved the capture of the latter, by which event he would be enabled to dictate his own terms; for, where a free choice remained to Maurice and equal temporal advantages could be secured, he preferred the religion which he and his subjects professed, to that of the emperor. He accordingly formed secret alliances with all the Protestant princes of the empire and with the king of France; England, Denmark and Poland, in which countries the ambition of the Spanish conqueror was feared and detested, readily gave their adherence. The result was the Convention of Passau mentioned above. This explanation is fully sustained by the character of Maurice who was a far-seeing and resolute man, and an unscrupulous politician, by the historic events which occurred in succession, and by the confessedly great

Reformed, and the "Ecclesiastical Reservation" (*reservatum ecclesiasticum*) which the Lutherans, although its dangerous character was not entirely hidden, were compelled by their want of superior military strength to yield to the bigotry and malice of the Papists.

influence which any leading religious principle such as that which Flacius represented, exercised in that age on the policy of rulers.

After the Convention of Passau which prohibited the introduction of any Interim such as those of Augsburg and Leipzig, the Interimistic and Adiaphoristic controversy was virtually at an end. Still, the ocean heaves convulsively long after the fury of the tempest has passed away; the principles involved in the controversy had not all been unanimously adjusted; personal feeling was not at once calmed. The controversialists, whom political influences no longer excited and pressing dangers of the Church did not alarm, discussed during several years the great topics which had led to such vast results in the external *status* of the Church.

The Wittenberg theologians gave their final statement in the *Expositio* of 1559 which we have already mentioned. They declare that the introduction of the adiaphora had originally proceeded from Maurice and not from them; that he had positively assured them that he would concede no essential principle to the emperor; that Saxony was threatened with war and devastation, by which the Church would have been seriously imperiled as it had been in Swabia; that they did not wish to appear as rebellious subjects of the empire; that in doctrines and in the sacraments, they had abandoned nothing that was essential; and that they had deemed it wise to concede certain adiaphora in order to preserve essentials. Their motives were honest, but the principles for which Flacius contended were those of a man of vast learning, profound wisdom and living faith, as well as of clear views derived from a philosophic study of history and of the danger of concessions in critical times. He lived in a period of transition when the Lutheran faith had, in its essential features, been already set forth in the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Two Catechisms, and the Smalcald Articles, but when certain points were still discussed in the Church, which these confessions had not prominently introduced. After the death of Flacius all these disturbing elements were controlled and finally determined by that noble confession, which is still the brightest jewel of all those which glitter on the brow of the Church—the *Formula of Concord*, adopted in 1580. The Adiaphora are considered in Article X. both of the Epitome and of the Full (Solida) Declaration. The Church there demonstrates the

scriptural character of the great principles for which Flacius contended with such fidelity and success (Henkel's Second Engl. ed. p. 581 sqq. 705 sqq.) Not a more glorious monument could have been erected to his memory than the incorporation in our creed of this article which so undisguisedly and faithfully espouses a fundamental principle of genuine Protestantism.*

We must somewhat more rapidly pass over the subsequent discussions in which Flacius was engaged. The *Osiandrian* controversy prevailed from 1549 to 1567. Andrew Osiander was an able and influential Reformer, and eloquent in the pulpit, but of a somewhat harsh and obstinate disposition. In his controversial writings he was excessively severe and even vulgar, when he described the persons of his opponents; the services which he really had rendered the Church, such as his agency in conducting Albert of Prussia to a knowledge of the truth, led him to adopt an arrogant style which disinterested persons regarded as intolerable. Hence his relations with his colleagues, when he received the appointment of professor of theology in Königsburg in 1549, became unfriendly and humiliating.

The erroneous doctrinal statements of Osiander included the following points: Luther had taught, in opposition to the popish doctrine, that our redemption comprehended a two-fold work of grace, namely, that our justification was an act of God performed for our benefit, and, that sanctification, as distinct from the former, was an act or influence of God by his Spirit *in man himself*. Osiander, somewhat after the manner of the Catholics, confounded these two divine operations; according to him, the forgiveness of our sins, or, our redemption, is, indeed, due to the Saviour's fulfilment of the law and to his sufferings and death; but he held, on the other hand, in opposition to Rom. ch. 4, that our justification

*We cannot too highly commend to the student of the history and the doctrines of this precious confession the following works: GÜSCHEL: *Die Concordien-Formel*; FRANK: *Die Theologie der Conc.* Of the latter, two volumes have already appeared. Happy would it have been for the Lutheran Church in this country if the principles which were finally recognized as scriptural, had been retained in their vitality and power. They were suppressed by that deplorable facility with which we have too often waved our "distinctive features" in doctrine and in usages, on the theory that these are "non-essentials." If a more virile spirit had prevailed, it would have secured for us the continuance of such unanimity and churchly feeling, that our religious, educational and social position at this time could be contemplated with feelings with which we have not yet been enabled to become familiar.

does not consist in the imputation to faith of Christ's merit, as distinct from our works, but in the fact that Christ with the righteousness of his *divine* nature which he possessed from all eternity, enters our hearts and thus *makes* us just or righteous. He denied Luther's doctrine that our justification proceeds from the imputation of the merits of Christ who as *God-Man* suffered and died in our place. He denied that Christ was our Saviour in his *human* nature also, and maintained that our righteousness was derived from that of the divine nature of Christ *exclusively*, thus virtually identifying the believer's justification with his sanctification, and undervaluing or depreciating the work of Christ on earth, which he finished on the cross. Albert, the friend and patron of Osiander, was distressed by the commotion which the latter raised in the Church, and applied to eminent theologians for counsel and aid, still being disposed to sustain Osiander. He accordingly offered to Flacius, whom the distress of the times had robbed of support and a home, a considerable sum of money and an honorable position in his territory, if he (Flacius) would espouse the cause of Osiander. He judged Flacius according to a common standard, and supposed that, as his relations with the Wittenberg theologians had been clouded by the previous controversy, he would now promptly defend Osiander whom Melancthon and his colleagues rightly denounced. But the lofty soul of Flacius existed only in God and his truth, and he replied: "I would rather contend *for* the truth in company with the Wittenberg professors who were my most determined opponents, than contend *against* the truth in company with my friend Osiander, even if the latter course were recommended by the prospect of an ample income." He now commenced the publication of various works on the subject, defends his philosophical positions by rich quotations from the classic writers, the Roman law, &c., and sustains his theological arguments by powerful appeals to the Scriptures and to the established facts of Christian experience. He defines the true nature or character of the righteousness of Christ with surprising acumen and depth, annihilates Osiander's fantastic theory respecting the "evangelical word" and the indwelling of divine righteousness in the believer (which the excellent Brenz confessed that he could not altogether comprehend), sets forth the errors of his exegesis, and triumphantly exposes the disingenuous mode in which Osiander had quoted passages from the writings of Augustine and

Luther. In vain did Osiander labor to point out distinctions between his own and the papistical doctrine—he still stood convicted of grievous departures from the doctrines of God's word. The mass of the subjects of Albert (who persisted in sustaining Osiander) espoused the views advocated by Flacius, Melancthon and the most eminent theologians of the day. Again did the divine blessing attend the labors of Flacius; the Church recognized the purity of his anti-Osiandrian doctrines by adopting them in the Formula of Concord, Art. III. (Henkel's ed. p. 638-641.)

About the year 1538 the Protestant Church in Silesia, Wurttemberg and elsewhere, was much disturbed by the vagaries of Schwenkfeld. His family, which was very ancient, ranked with the class termed in England *the gentry*. After having acquired a good education, he led the life of a worldly-minded courtier for several years. At length the subject of religion began to interest him deeply. He visited Luther in 1525, and studied his writings with diligence. But he had also become acquainted with the doctrines and practices of the Picards,* that is, no doubt, the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. He soon determined to become an independent reformer and propagate a system which none of his contemporaries had devised. He claimed that, by a special revelation from heaven, he had received the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther, he alleged, had *added to*, Zwingli, on the other hand, *taken from*, the

*This name, as a term of reproach was frequently applied by the Catholics to the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, Hussites, and Waldenses. The history of the Picard sect is very obscure; they were charged with the wildest fanaticism and licentiousness. After having been driven from Germany, they fled to Bohemia. The Moravian Brethren appear to be sustained by history in disowning the appellation as a calumny, since it belonged to a different and very corrupt sect. Probably the Beghards or Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit, mystics and fanatics of the foulest kind (both sexes associating in a nude state, whence called *Adamites*) attempted to identify themselves in Bohemia with non-Catholics whose morals were pure. The term *Picard*, according to Mosheim (Cent. XV. Part II. ch. V. §2) who is sustained by the most recent authorities (Herzog: Real-Ency. XI. Art. *Picarden*) is a Bohemian corruption of *Beghard*. It was applied by Catholics to all their opponents. That there is some confusion in the use of the name *Picard* seems to be demonstrated by the title of an Apology or Vindication presented by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren to George, Margrave of Brandenburg, which is the following: *Apologia veræ doctrinæ eorum, qui vulgo appellantur Waldenses vel Picardi, Retinuerunt enim Jo. Hussitæ doctrinam cum Scripturis sanctis consentientem*. Third edition 1538.

sense of the words of the institution, which, according to his revelation, should mean: *My body is this*, namely, food, the bread of life. The meaning of this formula is not fully apparent until we recollect that Schwenkfeld, who now yielded entirely to the mystical, or rather, fanatical tendency which his later associations had developed, entertained also the following views: Justification is the incarnation of Christ in the believer; justifying faith, which is a communication from the divine nature or substance itself, "a spark of the burning fire which is God," is not wrought in us through the medium of the external written or preached word, but immediately, that is, without means, through the divine operation of the Spirit. Christ's human nature was begotten of the substance of God; his flesh, although he was Mary's son, was not that of a creature, but was equally as divine as the divine nature itself; Christ's human nature, amalgamated or made one with his divine nature, was literally *deified*. The word of God is Christ alone; that which is also called *the word*, namely, the revealed doctrine when written or preached, is not, strictly speaking, the word of God, but merely an external testimony; the writings of the prophets and apostles were simply an imperfect sketch of the eternal word, merely accidental and transient. He also disapproved of Infant Baptism, and appears to have anticipated the doctrine since known as "Christian Perfection," by holding that the regenerated Christian can yield a perfect and complete obedience, so that he really lives without sin.

At this late period we are apt to imagine that Schwenkfeld's errors were rather theoretic than practical, as no charges are brought against his moral character, and that, consequently, the controversy with him was of little significance. But it must be remembered that he was the representative of a *system* of errors which coincided with the fundamental principles of the dangerous Anabaptists and of other misguided men in Southern and Western Germany. This system threatened to overthrow the visible Church of Christ and to afford a religious sanction to the indulgence of the wildest passions of the soul. By essentially corrupting the doctrine of justification by faith, and by virtually setting at naught the written and preached word, it threatened to paralyze the whole work of the Reformation at a most critical period. Hence serious disturbances occurred; Melancthon and the most eminent theologians published numerous writings, in which they specified and refuted the errors of Schwenkfeld,

chiefly those which involved his doctrine concerning the human nature of Christ. As, however, his pernicious errors respecting "the word of God" had not been directly examined and exposed, Flacius devoted himself to this important department of the controversy. His first work on the subject was published in 1553; the last, entitled: "Fifty gross errors, &c." appeared in 1559. He here exhibits the surprising stores of learning in philology, exegesis, philosophy and general theological science which he had amassed; his intellectual efforts are surpassed in power only by his devout sentiments, and we regret that we have no room to furnish the details. The labors of Flacius and the other defenders of the faith were signally blessed; the controversial skill of Schwenkfeld and his adherents, although they retorted in numerous publications, availed nothing. The sect ever since had a sickly existence, and its entire extinction is not far distant. As its fundamental errors were in nearly every case already virtually rejected in the existing confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, the Formula of Concord (Art. XII. Henkel's ed. p. 731) summarily dismisses the "Erroneous Articles of the Schwenkfeldians" and ratifies anew the principles for which Melanchthon, Flacius and others had so faithfully contended.

George Major, originally one of the students of Luther and Melanchthon, and afterwards a colleague and devoted adherent of the latter, in Wittenberg, had been regarded with a certain degree of suspicion by the stricter Lutherans ever since the publication of the Leipzig Interim. The latter had apparently made a dangerous concession to Popery by admitting that "good works are necessary to salvation." Melanchthon had originally introduced this language in his *Loci Communes* of 1535, but understood it in an evangelical sense, namely, that our acceptance with God, when it really occurs, must be manifested by new obedience to God. But as the language was misinterpreted in a popish sense, and was hence pointedly condemned by Luther, he subsequently omitted the obnoxious terms. In consequence of various unfortunate circumstances which seriously affected Major's comfort and character, he was induced to repeat in one of his publications the offensive phrase which even Melanchthon disavowed in 1555. Amsdorf, Flacius and Gallus at once assailed the putatively popish character of this proposition, and thus the *Majoristic Controversy* commenced in 1551 and continued during nearly twelve years. Flacius would possi-

bly have been a more lenient judge of Major, but the tergiversation of the latter, who attempted to avoid the odium of the Leipzig Interim by asserting that he had not been present at its adoption in Leipzig, while it was proved that he had assisted in preparing it previously in Celle, was one of many causes which induced Flacius to combat his error. The great objection to Major's Protean proposition was derived from the fact that such language ("good works are necessary to salvation"), even if capable of receiving an evangelical interpretation, had a most disastrous influence on many minds. On the one hand, it favored the popish doctrine of the meritoriousness of works and seemed to imply that men earned salvation. On the other hand, it robbed the penitent sinner, who could produce no good works of his own, and who depended solely on the merits of Christ, of all hope and consolation. Thus the all-sufficiency of Christ's atoning work lost its glory, and immortal souls were placed in imminent peril. Major replied that he understood the formula in a strictly evangelical sense, and ascribed no merit to human works; he re-asserted his faith in the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and he really appears, after the writings of Flacius and others had led him to investigate the subject anew, and had enabled him to obtain clearer views, to have regarded good works not as meriting salvation, nor as the price which man pays for it, but as results which God imperatively demands, and as the *necessary fruits* of that living faith by which alone we are justified. The religious experience of Flacius, who felt himself to be by nature a poor, helpless, lost sinner, and whose hopes of salvation were founded exclusively on the merits of Christ, induced him to combat every opinion which seemed in the smallest degree to impair the glory of Christ's redeeming work.

As the contending parties did not essentially differ in fundamental points, the controversy would not have assumed its large proportions, if Major could have remained calm in spirit and language, and if some of his adherents could have observed the rules of Christian discretion. One of the latter especially, Justus Menius, originally a monk, then an adherent of Melancthon, and by no means a decided opponent of the Leipzig Interim, avowed himself publicly as a friend both of Major's proposition and of the adiaphora. He combined with these views certain variations from the Protestant doctrine, which called forth a new publication from Flacius. But he had now acquired a safe position in Leipzig, and

assailed all his opponents with unsparing invectives. At this time the earnest and devout Amsdorf, the man of "the iron will," Luther's faithful personal friend, unhappily permitted Major and Menius to impel him to the other extreme, so that he advanced the proposition: "good works are not only not necessary to, but are also injurious to, salvation;" he published in 1559 a work intended especially to prove the truth and Christian character of the proposition. He undoubtedly intended only to express emphatically the sentiment, not that external good works are *per se* injurious, but that *reliance on them*, to the exclusion of Christ's merits, was evil, alluding to the Pharisees and Catholics who trusted that they would be saved by their works, to the dishonor of the grace of God. Here Flacius, whose whole life seems to have been one of martyrdom, and who was willing to die, but not to be separated from Christ, was compelled to combat his friend's doctrine, or rather, to expose the unscriptural character and folly of his extravagant assertion. He distinctly avowed that "good works are necessary" not indeed as earning salvation—for "faith is necessary to salvation"—but as the conditions without which faith and the spirit of prayer cannot abide in the soul. Subsequently Major retracted his suspicious expression so far as to admit unequivocally that man is justified by faith alone. The whole subject, after such a full discussion (only clouded at times by personalities and invective) conducted to the admirable statement of the Gospel doctrine, in strict accordance with the earlier confessions, which the Church gave in the Formula of Concord, Art. IV. (Henkel's ed. p. 641-649). Again were the positions taken by Flacius distinctly and fully sustained, and their scriptural character demonstrated.

It is obvious that so many controversies in the bosom of the Lutheran Church must have had a two-fold effect: on the one hand, they ultimately conducted men to clearer views of divine truth, and, in the kind Providence of God, surrounded our faith with impregnable bulwarks; on the other hand, they disturbed the peace of the Church, and seemed to arrest the progress of the Reformation; while the papist rejoiced, the true believer wept. "Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." (Tit. 1: 13). This apostolic precept could be applied by its inspired author with due moderation in his personal resistance to Peter's act of apparently yielding the principle respecting the terms on

which Gentiles were to be admitted into the Church (Gal. 2 : 11). That point had created serious difficulties, too, until it was decided at the first Council or Synod ever held in the Church (Acts. ch. 15). In the present case, Flacius and others who were deeply distressed by the commotions which prevailed in the Church, labored and prayed earnestly for a peace that promised to be permanent by being established, not on evasions, reticences, and dangerous concessions, but on Bible principles. During five years, from 1556 to 1561, the Lutheran theologians and princes held conventions, proposed articles of agreement, debated, labored and prayed; but the personal animosities which had been engendered, could not be at once allayed. Flacius had too deeply wounded the *amour-propre* of his adversaries to find them prompt in meeting conciliatory movements. But he retained the entire confidence of many influential theologians and princes; among the latter was, till a later period, John Frederic II.,* the chief founder of the University of Jena, which was opened in the spring of 1548. The princes were so eager to adopt articles of agreement that they were at first even willing to accede to the imperative demand of Frederic III., the elector Palatine, whose co-operation in the work of pacification could be purchased only by their adoption of Melancthon's altered text of the Augsburg Confession of 1540 in preference to the original text of 1530. The same disinterested fidelity which in Luther so powerfully influenced the three Saxon electors, (Frederic, John and John Frederic) in their adherence to truth and principle, was now revealed in Flacius, whose influence over their immediate successor was in this crisis equally happy. The result was that the elector Augustus (the brother and successor of Maurice, who died in 1553 from the effects of a wound), Joachim, elector of Brandenburg, Christopher of Wurtemberg, Philip of Hesse, Charles of Baden, Ulrich of Mecklenburg, the palgrave George, and numerous margraves, dukes and cities, the ecclesiastical authorities of their respective territories as represented by chosen theologians, and indeed the mass of those who professed to hold the Lutheran faith, with the exception of Frederic III. (who united with the Reformed in 1560 and subsequently caused the Heidelberg Catechism to be prepared), united heartily in the adoption of measures of

*He is called in German "the Intermediate" (der Mittlere), probably in order to distinguish him from his father John Frederic I. the Magnanimous (whose electorate was assigned to Maurice) and from his son John Frederic III., who died in 1565 without issue.

peace. They re-affirmed their adherence to the *unaltered* Augsburg Confession of 1530, as interpreted in the sense which the recent controversies had proved to be the genuine Lutheran sense. The decision of the convention in Naumburg, 1561, which had produced great dissatisfaction by its recognition of the text of 1540 was effectually revoked, and harmony at length secured.

The last controversy in which Flacius was involved, was most unfortunate. As the influence which he subsequently exercised on the Church and the expression of her doctrine, was not decisive, we may rapidly pass over the events. After having declined the offer of a professorship in Heidelberg, he accepted, in 1557, a very important position in Jena, where, in addition to his exegetical lectures in the University, he and Erhard Schnepf were entrusted with the general supervision of the ecclesiastical affairs of the country. During the next year, Pfeffinger, professor in Leipzig, a former Interimist, published a work in which views respecting Free Will were expressed that aroused the indignation of many eminent men. Flacius could not withhold his own testimony, when truth and error engaged in a conflict, but was assailed in turn by Strigel, one of his own colleagues. Thus the *Synergistic Controversy** commenced, and raged till the year 1567; it referred originally to the points: a) *Whether*, b) *How*, c) *To what degree* the free will of man co-operated (whence the name, *συνεργία*) in the work of his conversion, &c. Vast numbers of publications were issued, many public discussions were held, innumerable sermons were preached and printed, political power was invoked and exercised, party spirit was remorseless, and the result was the deposition of Flacius from his office in December, 1561. Wigand, Musæus, Judex and many faithful men shared in the sentence of banishment. We cannot here attempt to furnish any details of this controversy, which alone would furnish materials for an extended article. He first went to Bußleben, then to Fulda, and ultimately, in 1562, to Ratisbon. The merits of the question are fully discussed by Preger and by F. H. R. Frank (Vol. I. *passim*), to whom we refer for the details. The writer of the article in Herzog's

**Synergism* is thus defined in Herzog's Real-Encyk. XV. 326, a work which, as a whole, no reader will accuse of very strong Lutheran tendencies: "It is a sublimated Semipelagianism, in the form in which it was held in the age of the Reformation by its representatives Erasmus, and in particular by Melancthon and his school."

Real-Encyk. (G. Frank, quoted above, in a note), declines to enter into a dogmatic examination of the difficult subject and merely furnishes the historical facts. He adds: "The Formula of Concord ultimately decided the contested points, and, indeed, in essentials, in accordance with the views of Flacius."

In his great distress Flacius found a temporary asylum in Ratisbon for his wife and seven children, but no means of support were at hand; he had never been a pastor and could not have accepted such an office, as he did not speak German fluently, however skilfully he expressed himself with his pen in that language.* The magistrates of the city would not allow him to perform any act except to instruct a few private scholars in his own lodging. He sold his patrimony, however, in 1563, when he re-visited Venice, and his immediate wants were now supplied; wealthy individuals were also liberal to him, so that he was even enabled to invest 2100 dollars in city funds, for the benefit of his large family. The bond, which is still extant, dated "Eve of St. Thomas, 1563," secures to him the interest, amounting to 105 dollars per annum; German dollars or *Thaler* are to be here understood. The unfounded charge of taking usury, which his opponents produced, was probably derived from this transaction; the facts which he stated in a vindication of his conduct were never disproved.

At this period (1564), when he was without a permanent home or employment, his faithful wife, the mother of twelve children, was taken from him by death. Her zeal and ability had relieved him from many domestic duties which now sorely oppressed him. At a later period, when the care of three promising daughters, who needed the attention of a mother, weighed on his mind, he listened to the advice of his friends, and married the daughter of a deceased clergyman named Ilbeck. Domestic trials connected with the sickness of some of his children, and the death of others, bowed the strong man to the ground; still, his literary labors, his controversial writing, his defence of Protestantism against popery, and his general advocacy of the Lutheran or Gospel doctrine, were maintained with unimpaired vigor. On one

*It is simply the blunder of a compiler when we read in Appleton's New American Cyclop. VII. *Art. FLACIUS*: "He retired to Ratisbon, and afterwards preached in several German cities."—He himself remarks in a letter to Gallus: "*Si ob testes imperitos erit germanice loquendum, tu seis me id præstare non posse.*"

occasion, in 1566, when certain Jesuits attempted to seize his person, he narrowly escaped by providential aid. He travelled incessantly in the service of the Church, made a personal appeal to the emperor in Augsburg (April 14, 1566), and was again providentially delivered from popish snares, but still suffered annoyance from the fears and timid counsels of the Ratisbon magistracy. At length the imperial influence which was excessively hostile to such a fearless defender of the faith, compelled the magistrates to request Flacius to seek a home in another city. He retired to Antwerp in 1566, where he rendered important services to the Lutheran Church, sojourned in Frankfort, and ultimately retired to Strasburg, where he arrived Nov. 14, 1568. He had, previously to the last date, paid a visit to Stutgard, where his admirable spirit, devout sentiments and vast learning afforded for several days much enjoyment to the excellent brethren in the faith who labored in that city.

These frequent migrations were in a great measure occasioned by the relentless persecutions of his enemies, Protestants as well as Catholics, who could not subdue his inflexible spirit, and who dreaded his intellectual power and tenacity of purpose in exposing every departure from God's word. They purposed to expel him from Germany as the most formidable opponent whom they could encounter. The magistracy of Strasburg, yielding, however, to the intercession of various noblemen and eminent theologians, granted him permission to reside temporarily with his family in their city. Here he and Jacob Andreae, whose heart and soul were devoted to the work of a stable pacification of the Church (in which he eventually succeeded by divine aid, when the Formula of Concord was finally adjusted), made various unsuccessful efforts to construct a series of doctrinal articles which all the parties that still differed in views could conscientiously adopt. At this period, when John William succeeded his brother John Frederic II. as Duke of Thuringia, the rigid Lutheran professors who had been expelled from Jena were re-called, with the exception of Flacius; the new duke did not venture to reinstate him, in consequence of the opposition to that step on the part of his powerful neighbor, the elector of Saxony. However much we admire the character of Augustus, and however gratefully we acknowledge his services in promoting the composition and adoption of the Formula of Concord, we cannot overlook the circumstances that in this instance—his treatment of Flacius—he

was eminently unjust, even in view of the only apparent aberration in doctrine of which Flacius was ever guilty, and which will be presently noticed. Blind and corrupt Jews, who would not understand the causes for which the blessed Saviour "came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10: 34) might, from their point of view accuse Paul and his associates of being the authors of the confusion which often arose when they entered a city, and might charge them with "turning the world upside down" (Acts 17: 6). But Augustus, with clearer views of divine truth and purer principles, allowed his judgment to be clouded by the insinuations of artful enemies of Flacius: he accused him of being "a foreign vagrant, who had, during twenty years, produced all the unchristian and vexatious contentions which had occurred among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession." At a later period of his life, when he detected the arts of evil counsellors whom he had trusted, he unequivocally and now consistently sustained the strictly orthodox Lutherans.—The authorities of the free city of Strasburg, submitted to electoral influences, and directed Flacius to withdraw. Even the emperor assailed the friendless man and denounced all who would afford him aid.

The most prolific source of these troubles was a single expression which Flacius employed; while he conscientiously and resolutely defended it, he manifested a spirit of obstinacy and harshness in dealing with his opponents which is an indelible blemish on the portrait of this great and good man. At the memorable "disputation" or debate between Flacius and Strigel, Aug. 2-8, 1560, on Original Sin, Free Will, &c., which was conducted exclusively in the Latin language, Strigel had asserted that Original Sin was an "*accidens*," a philosophical term to which mediæval theology had given a definition which allied it to false views of the papists respecting the original righteousness of man before the fall.* The

*Melancthon had thus defined the word in his *Erotemata Dialectices* (of the third edition of which in 1547 three thousand copies were sold in three weeks—an interesting fact for authors and publishers): *Accidens est, quod non per se subsistit, nec est pars substantiæ, sed in alio est mutabiliter*. Some *accidentia*, he adds, are *separabilia*, as the warmth of water, others *inseparabilia*, as the heat of fire. Again: *Accidens est quod adest et abest præter* (without, in either case conditioning) *subjecti corruptionem*. *Substantia*, on the other hand, *est Ens, quod revera proprium esse habet, nec est in alio, ut habens esse a subjecto*. This definition applies also to God; the following is then given for created objects, only: *Substantia est Ens, quod habet proprium esse et sustinet accidentia*. Strigel availed himself of this last defini-

term alarmed Flacius; it seemed to deny the grave character of man's depravity, to diminish the glory of the atoning work of Christ, and to countenance the fundamental error of Pelagianism. As the familiar antithetic term was *substantia*, he adopted, as the expression of his view, the proposition: *Original Sin is the SUBSTANCE of man.*" Almost every later historian has permitted himself to assume that Flacius understood his proposition in a sense which it may undoubtedly receive, and for which no terms of obloquy would be too severe. But Preger, who has thoroughly studied the publications issued at the time, throws new light on the subject. Flacius, who was well acquainted with the works of Aristotle,* took the word *accidens* in the sense of the Aristotelian συμβεβηκός (*accidental, non-essential*), and could not conscientiously apply so lenient a term to Original Sin. The point belonged to metaphysics rather than to Dogmatic Theology; neither the Latin, nor the German of that age, furnished terms that adequately and unequivocally expressed all the abstractions involved in the dispute, and this circumstance was one of the misfortunes of Flacius. He never meant that "Original Sin" and "the substance of man" were identical, nor that the subject and predicate were convertible terms. He only desired to teach that Original Sin is not a trivial circumstance, a mere appendage, or an addition which might act as a clog, without vitiating the substance or nature of man, but that, on the contrary, man is "totally corrupt" (precisely the *corruptio totius naturæ* of the Form. Conc. R. 640, 11, and the quotation: *Durch Adams Fall ist ganz verderbt menschlich Natur und Wesen*, ib. 643, 23). His language, misunderstood or misinterpreted, and which, unfortunately, he would not recall, as he deemed his explanations to be sufficient, produced a great sensation, which was intensified when he published his principle work on Original Sin in 1567. His enemies naturally availed themselves of the circumstance to heap odium on him; but even Lutherans like J. Andreæ, M. Chemnitz and Heshusius assailed him

tion, in order to prove the non-substantiality of Original Sin. Flacius responded that such language would cause Original Sin to fade into a mere shadow. His opponents combined their efforts against Flacius, but their views diverged widely when they defined an *accidens*.

*An edition of all the works of Aristotle was published in Basel in 1550; the editors remark that Flacius had furnished them with very valuable annotations on various works of the Stagirite, and describe him as a man "in literis Græcis, presertim in Aristotele, acri judicio præditus."

with inexorable rigor, and urged him to retract the offensive and absurd formula. Public discussions were held, vast numbers of publications appeared, the plan of discarding forever both terms, *substantia* and *accident*, was considered, but peace could not be secured.—The whole controversy was ultimately settled like others, in the fear of God, in strict conformity to the truth, and with no admixture of error, in the Formula of Concord, Art. I. and II, (Henkel's ed. pp. 597-629). Every Manichean and Pelagian interpretation is jealously excluded, the erroneous interpretation of the Flacian formula is disowned unequivocally and in detail, as well as the antithetic errors; the vexatious terms *substantia* and *accidens* are excluded from public religious instructions, but the latter is recognized in a very guarded manner as a correct term in theological discussions of the subject. The whole of the two articles is so admirably framed that a careful examination of the doctrines of Flacius leads us to the conclusion, that, if he had lived, he would, with a good conscience have added his own signature, and blessed God for having restored a peace to the Church which could be permanent, because it was established on clearly recognized and well-defined truths of God's word.

The friends of Flacius were not as powerful as his enemies, and he was compelled in the spring of 1573 to leave his wife and several sick children behind, and seek an asylum elsewhere. He found it in the neighborhood of Fulda, in the castle of Ridesel, hereditary marshal of Hessa. The latter appears to have secured for him a place of refuge in the convent of the White Nuns in Frankfort on the Maine,* where he placed his family in June of the same year. He then visited his faithful friend Count Vollrath of Mansfield, and had a very satisfactory interview in Berlin with John George, elector of Brandenburg. Musculus, the General Superintendent of the Church, testified that he was perfectly satisfied with the views of Flacius respecting Original Sin, although he could not approve of his phraseology. Other eminent theologians acquitted him fully of the charge of Manicheism which was connected with the dispute, and sanctioned his doctrine after he had expressed a willingness to abandon his phraseology, provided that Original Sin should not be considered as a mere "accident."

*It had ceased to be a monastic institution, and its income was controlled by a Protestant lady at this time, Catharine von Meeßfeld, who, with the aid of certain trustees, applied the funds to the support of the families of deceased meritorious citizens.

But Augustus so intimidated the magistracy of Frankfort, that on Dec. 21, 1573 they passed a resolution that Flacius should remove from the city with his family in twenty-four hours; his absence at the time secured his family from the execution of the decree. Catharine, who superintended the institution in which they lodged, regarded the conduct of the authorities as an outrage offered to humanity and religion, and the remonstrances of various men of rank who were friends of Flacius, prevailed. In the month of August of the next year Flacius returned to his family after a prolonged absence in Silesia and elsewhere, and the magistrates tacitly permitted him to remain. But the eternal repose of the weary man was at hand. Violent pains attending an attack of dysentery, and other symptoms of a change assailed the sufferer in January, 1575; he could no longer pursue his literary labors which persecution and poverty had never succeeded in interrupting; in March he was conscious that death was not far distant. Two of the pastors of the city, Beyer and Ritter, visited him repeatedly, afforded him the consolations of the Gospel, and, on the 10th of March administered to him the Lord's Supper for the last time. During the succeeding night the symptoms assumed a very aggravated character which could be only partially relieved by the opiates of his physician Lonicer. He awoke on Friday morning (March 11, 1575), and was perfectly conscious; he at once folded his hands, twice repeated the words: *Jesu Christe, fili Dei, miserere mei!* (Jesus Christ, thou Son of God, have mercy on me!), and then peacefully fell asleep in the Lord. His age was 55 years and 8 days. His remains were honorably and numerously attended to the grave in the church-yard of St. Peter's.

His portrait, taken at a late period of his life exhibits strongly-marked features, a Roman nose and firmly compressed lips; his face is wasted by care and sorrow, but its lines reveal the presence in the living man of an unconquered spirit; the brow, surmounted by the customary cap, is arched, and his beard extends from the upper lip far below the neck. He combined with the inextinguishable ardor of the Italian the noblest features of the German character; his fidelity and truth were extraordinary; to his amazing industry, his vast and profound learning, and his genius, even bitter foes paid the tribute of their admiration; his private character, although often assailed by his contempor-

aries, remained unsullied to the end; and that he was a sincere Christian, an humble, spiritually-minded and holy man, his whole history demonstrates. We may add that neither Preger nor any historian whom we have consulted, presents any facts which would indicate that Flacius possessed the suavity, the delicacy of sentiment, or the beautiful domestic traits which graced the character of Luther. He was more like the severe John, the preacher of the wilderness than like John, the beloved disciple—he rose above men more like the rugged Mount Sinai that burned with fire, than like the green, sunny mount on which the Saviour delivered the divine Sermon. Possibly his spirit was rather that of the prophet who called down fire from heaven than of Stephen who prayed for his murderers. But God's ways are always wise; he selects and endows his servants with precisely those gifts which they need in extending his kingdom on earth. If Flacius, like king David, conducted the wars of the Lord (1 Chron. 22 : 6–10), the Solomons who succeed and build the house of the Lord in more peaceful times may gratefully remember that their work is materially facilitated by the treasures which the toil and sufferings of Flacius had accumulated.

It is difficult for us at this distant age to do entire justice to the leading men of the times of Flacius. Many of their contentions seem to have a trivial origin, and their language often appears to betray very bitter feelings. It was unquestionably a rude age, and the manners were not refined, but the men were honest. We may discern impetuosity, scorn, even obstinacy and animosity in Flacius, in his friends and in his opponents, but not hypocrisy, not servility, not smooth speeches and smiles which veil the gall that overflows in the heart. These men were Christian heroes and martyrs; they had but recently been emancipated from the toils and pestilential atmosphere of popery, and had learned to breathe with delight the pure, vital air of true religion. They had not been conducted, as we have been, from childhood to maturity, in the peaceful enjoyment of civil and religious rights; the powerful enemy of the truth, not yet crushed, might still wrest the half-won victory from their grasp, and they were, accordingly, far more sensitive and jealous than we usually suppose that we have reason to be. They could not tolerate doctrinal error — it seemed to them like a renunciation of God; it was a suicidal act in their eyes to deviate one step from Christ and his word. Hence even when Flacius and

his opponents were most bitter and reproachful in language, each honestly believed that he was only defending God's own truth.

But our exhibition of the *times* of Flacius has prevented us from doing justice to his *gigantic* literary labors; the term is strictly true; they were confessedly *colossal* in their proportions. Many of his works were printed; some are still in manuscript in the libraries of Copenhagen, Wittenberg, Augsburg, Erlangen, Leipzig, Munich, Schweinfurt, Zurich and elsewhere. Preger mentions in detail the extraordinary number of about 275 writings, pamphlets and books, many of which were printed, and nearly all of which Preger was enabled to examine personally. Several of these still possess the highest value. His studies in Church History he had always continued with zeal, and in 1553 commenced his preparations for that comprehensive work which constitutes an enduring monument of this great man—we refer to the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, a Church History embodying all the information on the subject which was accessible. Ranke's high praise of the work (V. 384) receives a cordial response from every writer who can appreciate genius, industry and the love of truth. The conception of the work, which constituted an era, originated in the fertile mind of Flacius; the execution was the joint work of himself, Wagner, Wigand, Judex, Faber and many subordinate laborers; the city of Magdeburg constituted the head-quarters of the collaborators, and had the honor of associating its name with this distinguished work. Eleven folio volumes, embracing the history of the first thirteen centuries of the Christian Church were published between the years 1559 and 1574. The labor of directing his associates was immense; the responsibility and the expense often threatened to crush Flacius; but by God's help he persevered in the work till he died.

Another great work of Flacius—*Clavis Scripturæ*—in two folio volumes, was originally printed in 1567 in Basel; the first volume is a dictionary explanatory of scriptural words translated into Latin; the second refers to the principles of Scripture interpretation. The noble work is not merely that of a pioneer; its publication at a time when Popery had corrupted all the sources of knowledge, constituted, like the former, an era in theological science, and its intrinsic value no later publication

can entirely annul.* His exegetical publications also materially subserved the cause of divine truth, and, like all his writings, were distinguished by variety of learning, depth of thought and the devout spirit which they breathed.

We cherish the memory of Flacius with heart-felt thankfulness to God who employed him as a faithful witness of the truth at a period when the Church was sorely tried by external and internal convulsions. His great services, in the blessings of which we now share, by no means lose their own lustre, even if in one important case his frailty as an "earthen vessel" cast a shade on his name. Moses, "who was faithful in all his house" (Heb. 3: 4) on one sad occasion "spake unadvisedly with his lips" (Ps. 106: 33; Numb. ch. 20; Deut. 32: 48-22), and therefore died without being permitted to see his people established in the promised land. Flacius erred in his adoption of a doctrinal formula, which, however scriptural his own interpretation might be, was an offence to the Church; he was not permitted to live until he could share in the blessings which the Church reaped when, five years after he was called away, it adopted with unanimity and success the Formula of Concord. Of the necessity and value of this magnificent Confession of faith, which the orthodox Lutheran Church still devoutly receives, the foregoing historical facts furnish the demonstration.—God needs the services of no special servant; he employs the one in a great work, but can readily raise up another and endow him with all the needful qualifications. To Flacius he assigned an honorable task, and then called him to his rest. May later historians show more impartial justice to him than many who have already described him! While they own that he was a mere creature of the dust, may they also gratefully praise God for having raised up such a faithful witness of the truth, and for having so abundantly blessed his great work, that as long as the Church stands, she will be largely indebted for the purity of her faith to the disinterested and devout labors of MATTHIAS FLACIUS ILLYRICUS.

*We append an *American* testimony to the value of the *Clavis*. The following as the name of a former owner of a copy, in excellent preservation, presented to the library of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, and as his personal tribute to Flacius, may be seen on the fly-leaf: "Henr. Muhlenberg, Jun. 1776." Below the name are the words: "Liber utilissimo consilio scriptus, optimisque observationibus repletus. Utere eo et experieris." The title page indicates a later edition: "Basileæ. 1609."

ARTICLE III.

THE MYSTERIOUS UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN
NATURES IN THE SON OF GOD.

By G. A. LINTNER, D. D., Schoharie, N. Y.

The holy evangelist John begins his Gospel, by asserting the great doctrine of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. He tells us, that He was from the beginning with God, that He was God, and that by Him all things were created. He speaks of Him as the Sovereign Creator of the Universe, co-eternal and co-existent with the Father, possessing all the power and glory, He had with Him from the beginning, before the world was created.

Having exhibited the doctrine of Christ's divinity in its fullest and clearest light, he proceeds to speak of His humanity. "The word was made flesh, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," John 1: 14. He speaks of Christ's humanity in close connection with His divinity, and says, that the eternal word, which was in the beginning with God the Father, co-equal with Him, took upon himself our nature, and became a man.

In this assumption of humanity, the Son of God did not divest himself of His divinity. When He became a man, He did not cease to be God. He was as truly God after he was born of the Virgin Mary, and laid in the manger at Bethlehem, as he was, when with God the Father before the foundation of the world; with the divine nature, and all its essential attributes and glory, he was also as truly man, as any of our race that have lived and suffered, and died, since we were first created; sin only excepted. Two natures are united in one person. This great fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, the evangelist teaches. He teaches the mysterious union of the divine and human natures in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. And this doctrine revealed in Scripture, which we deem essential to true Christianity, we propose to exhibit and illustrate with some practical remarks in this communication.

When the Son of God came into the flesh, he assumed our nature. And this assumption was complete in all its parts. It was an assumption of all our faculties, feelings, affections, sympathies and infirmities, with this single exception, that it was free from sin. It was an extraordinary and miraculous assumption by the power of the Highest, and the operation of the Holy Spirit, causing it to be perfectly pure and holy. The body which Christ assumed when he became man, was conceived in a supernatural manner by the Holy Ghost, and consequently wholly exempt from the hereditary corruption of our nature. Though it was a body like ours, subject to like feelings, affections, and infirmities, it was perfectly pure and holy like God. It was a body fully adapted to a union with the divine nature. If the body of Christ had not been a holy body, perfectly free from sin, it could not have been united to the divine nature; for God is of purer eyes than to behold evil. He cannot even look on sin, much less be united to, and have communion with it.

It behooved Christ when he assumed our nature, in all things to be made "like unto His brethren;" so that he could be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, and take our place, bear our iniquities, and render a satisfaction for our sins. This was necessary that He might make an atonement for us—but it was also necessary that He should sanctify us, and set us a holy example. "Such an High Priest, therefore, became us, as is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." Heb. 7 : 26.

This union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ is not such a union as confounds the two together, so that they cannot be distinguished from each other. This is an error into which some have fallen; and it is an error, which has given rise to many strange notions, and involved this subject in many imaginary difficulties. *Nestorius*, Bishop of Constantinople, who was the founder of a sect in the 5th Century, and has many followers in Western Asia even to this day, supposed that in Christ, there were not only *two natures*, but also *two persons* (hypostases) of which one was divine, and the other human; that these two persons appeared to be united in what he termed only one *aspect*; that the union which was formed in the incarnation of the Son of God, was not a union of nature, and of person, but of will and affection, and that consequently *Mary* the mother of Christ who gave birth only to the Son of God in the flesh, could not be called the mother of God. He taught that

Christ in his human nature was a being altogether separate from the divine nature, and that when he suffered and died on the cross, he suffered and died as man and not as God. This was the doctrine of *Nestorius* which was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, the third general Council of the Church. *Eutyches* a distinguished teacher also of the 5th century who was strenuously opposed to the doctrine of *Nestorius* held that there was but *one nature* in Christ, the divine, which he had with God the Father from all eternity. He denied the *humanity* of Christ, and was condemned and excommunicated for this heresy in the Council, assembled at Constantinople, about the middle of the 5th century.

The divine and human natures are so connected in the person of Christ, as to form an inseparable union in one undivided person. To establish this point, we have the direct testimony of the Scriptures. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2: 9. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the *form of a servant*, and was made in the *likeness of men*. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is *above every name*. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is *the Lord*, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2: 6—11. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth *his Son* made of a *woman*. Gal. 4: 4. The word was made *flesh*,* and

* "Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο." John 1: 14. The Socinians lay great stress on the signification which they attach to the Greek word *ἐγένετο*. They say the word here used is not to be construed, according to our common English version, *was made*, but that it simply signifies *was*; so that according to their construction the word *was flesh*, instead of *was made flesh*. Without referring to numerous other versions of the Sacred Scriptures, to show that the sense which our English translation gave to this word is correct; we would merely observe, that if the construction, which the Socinians have endeavored to force upon the passage, were admitted, it would not prove their doctrine. For if the word was with God in the beginning, and was God before anything was created, there must have been a time, when it could not have been in the flesh; when therefore at any time it became flesh, or was flesh, it must have been *made* so; and the *λογος*, that is the word, must be God incarnate.

dwelt among us. John 1: 14. Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, *a man*, approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God made that same Jesus, whom *ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ*. Acts 2: 22-36.

This doctrine is distinctly set forth in our Confession. "We also teach, that God the Son became man, was born of the Virgin Mary, and that the two natures, divine and human, inseparably united together in one person, are one Christ, who is true God and man, who was truly born, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he was a sacrifice not only for original sin, but also for all other sins, and reconciled the wrath of God; also that the same Christ descended into hell, truly arose from the dead on the third day, that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God—that he eternally rules over, and governs all his creatures—that he sanctifies, strengthens, and comforts through his Holy Spirit all who believe in him, and gives unto them life, and various gifts and blessings—and that he defends and protects them against the devil, and against sin—also, that the same Lord Christ will publicly come, and judge the living and the dead." *Augsburg Confession. Art. III.*

When the Lord Jesus Christ took upon himself our nature, he humbled himself. He was made poor. He could say, "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have their nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. But in this state of humiliation and suffering, he was still "God manifest in the flesh." He did not divest himself of any of the essential attributes and properties of his divine nature. He retained all the power and glory which he had with the Father from the beginning. In the incarnation of the Son of God there is a personal union, or rather a common participation, a mutual communication of the two natures, human and divine, and yet each retaining its peculiar and characteristic properties, which in a theological phrase is termed *communicatio idiomatum*. This is the doctrine of the Lutheran Church. As Lutherans, we differ from both the Nestorian and Eutychian views. We do not believe that there is either *one nature* or any such thing as *two persons* in Christ, appearing under one

aspect, but hold that the two natures, divine and human, are inseparably united in one person who is true God and man.

Luther speaking of the error of Nestorius on this subject, uses the following language, "We must attribute the *Idiomata*, that is, the properties of both natures, human and divine, to the same person Christ, both God and man; so that what is said of him, as *God*, may also be said of him as *man*. For instance, when we say Christ died, it may with propriety be said, God died; for Christ is God, not in an abstract separate sense, but God united to man. In an absolute, separate sense, it could not be true that Christ died as God, but as God-man he truly died. And when Nestorius represented the idea of God dying on the cross, as something unreasonable, he should have remembered, that it was no more unreasonable, than that the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary, in consequence of which, God, who is immortal, became subject to mortal pains and sufferings. The man Christ could not have been a true man, without such properties as are peculiar to man. He must have been what the *Manicheans* made him, an imaginary being. So also on the other hand the divine nature and properties were united to man in the person of Christ, so that it can be properly said, Christ created the world, and is almighty. For God and man in this case are one person—a *communicatio idiomatum* of two natures in the same person. Nestorius held that the Virgin Mary could not be called the mother of God,* because no human being could give birth to that

*It would seem that about the time of the Nestorian controversy the Virgin Mary had very generally acquired the title of *θεοτοκος*, the mother of God. From this term which was first used in the early Greek Churches, the Latins subsequently derived the title of *Deigenetrix*. This designation of the Virgin Mary occasioned much bitter and useless controversy in the churches. General Councils were called to settle the dispute; and it appears that at the Council of *Ephesus*, where *Nestorius* was condemned for denying that *Mary* was the "mother of God," the title which previously had been in general use, was confirmed. The respect and veneration with which the early Christians regarded the memory of the mother of Christ was soon carried to unreasonable excess. Churches and altars were erected, from which invocations and prayers were addressed to her as a Goddess who exercised supreme control over her divine Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. These extravagant devotions which are still rendered to her in many places, show how God may be dishonored by religious services which he never instituted and are expressly forbidden in his Word.

We venerate the name of the *Holy Virgin* for her sacred relation to

which is divine; or in other words, that Christ could not derive his divine nature from his incarnation. It does not necessarily follow from our doctrine that Christ derived his divine nature from the mother that gave him birth. We teach that he existed as God long before he was born in the flesh. Still when he became incarnate—when he was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin, he was God; and I can see no inconsistency in calling the mother of Christ, an incarnate God, the mother of God. Would there be any impropriety in saying that a woman giving birth to a child was the mother of an immortal being, having a soul, though she could not give birth to the soul, which comes from God. She gave birth to a being having a twofold nature, body and soul, and consequently in one sense, she is the mother of both. So also *Mary*, the mother of Christ, who brought forth her first-born Son in a personal and inseparable union with the Son of God, who was God from all eternity, may be said to be the mother of God." *Luther's Works: Jena Edition, 1766.*

The doctrine of the inseparable union of the divine and human natures, and the mutual participation of their respective properties in the person of our blessed Redeemer, was a prominent feature in the Christology of the ancient Christian Church. It was recognized and confirmed in the Council of *Nice*, which condemned the Arian heresy,* and subsequently

the Son of God. *Elizabeth*, the mother of John the Baptist, was divinely inspired, when she called her "the mother of the Lord." The term was not inappropriate, and as Luther said, we can see no impropriety in using it. While we deprecate the superstitious reverence and idolatrous worship, which the Virgin Mary receives in the Church of Rome, we deem her worthy of being honored as the most "blessed among women."

*The Arians, whose origin can be traced back to a very early period of the Church, acknowledged the Lord Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, but denied his divinity. They considered him a sort of superangelic being, above all others, whom God had created; but inferior to the Father, and not entitled to the worship, which is due to God alone. While they were unwilling to ascribe to him any of the essential perfections of Deity, they held that he was endowed with certain extraordinary properties and qualities, enabling him to do many wonderful works which no other human being ever performed, or could perform. These powers and acts they attributed to a union of the word with the flesh, which they represented as something analagous to the union of body and soul in man. They strenuously opposed the doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, and endeavored to prove by a variety of arguments, which they pretended to derive from reason and Scripture, that he was no more than a man, distinguished by extraordinary gifts and powers. This early heresy was condemned by the

more fully established in the Council of *Chalcedon* by the following clear and decided testimony. "We teach that Christ is one, the Son, the Lord, the Only Begotten, made known to be of two natures, unconfounded, immutable, indivisible, inseparable; the distinction of the two natures, however in no part being destroyed, on account of the oneness, but rather on the contrary, the peculiarity of each nature being preserved, and both concurring in the formation of one person, and one hypostasis." This testimony was also incorporated in the *Athanasian Creed*, which was adopted by the Church after the Apostolic Creed, as a symbol of Christian doctrine. In that Formula it is asserted, "That Christ is perfect God, and perfect man, that although he is God and man, he is yet not two, but one Christ. One, not in that the Deity is converted into human flesh, but in that the Deity has taken upon himself humanity, that he is indeed one, not by confounding together two natures, but in that he is one person; for like as a rational soul and body constitute one man, so God and man are one Christ." *Thomasius' Contrib. Christology of the Church.*

The Lutheran Church embodied in her Confession the essential import of the ancient Confessions of the Church, in regard to the doctrine under consideration. It was the design of Luther and the founders of our Church, to preserve, and transmit to posterity in a symbolic form, the pith and substance of the faith, which the early Christians professed on this topic. And as a Church we have adhered to this faith, while on the one hand, we have endeavored to keep pace with the advancement of theological science and the de-

Council of Nice in 325. The doctrine, however, continued to spread and was so successfully propagated that in ten years after their excommunication, *Arius* and his followers were restored to the communion and privileges of the Church. Towards the close of the sixth century, the sect became very much reduced, and almost extinct. It was revived in subsequent periods under favorable auspices, and at no time, since it began to prevail, was the Church entirely free from it. It is said, that the learned *Erasmus* favored it in the sixteenth century, about the time of the Reformation. After him *Servetus* openly avowed and advocated it in a treatise, which he published against the doctrine of the Trinity, at Geneva in 1531. In still later periods it was defended by the celebrated *Dr. Priestley*, and other distinguished writers, who published treatises on the subject. The Arians in this country are divided into various sects, and comprehend in their general system the Unitarians, Socinians, Christians, and all other denominations, who are opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the hypostatic union of the Deity and humanity of Christ.

velopment of truth since the publication of the ancient symbols of our faith; we have, on the other, carefully guarded against error. In the great leading features of the evangelical system, which are essential to true Christianity, we have fallen upon no new theories, nor suffered ourselves to be misled by the spirit of reckless innovation, which has caused so much evil in modern times.* We have simply adhered to the testimony of the Word of God, and those early witnesses of the truth, who have contended earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. We feel grateful to them for the firmness and unwavering fidelity with which they defended and preserved the truth, amid all the heresies and persecutions to which they were exposed, and we deem it our sacred duty, and highest privilege to follow their example, in maintaining the Scriptural doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God, the God-man, the only ground and hope of our Salvation.

The Deity and humanity of Christ are so combined in the unity of his person, as to form an inseparable connexion; and this connexion is so essential and necessary in the person of the Son of God, that he cannot be said to exercise any of the powers and attributes of the divine, without the presence and association of his human nature; neither can he act or suffer in his humanity, without the sympathy and participation of his divinity.[†] For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore, in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make recon-

*It must be admitted, that there was a time, when the Lutheran Church in Europe, and in this country was in great danger of losing her original and distinctive character. Men professing a high regard for Luther, and the founders of our Church, were so far carried away by their rationalistic principles and tendencies, as to be ready to forsake the Scriptural, sound, time-honored doctrines of our Confession, to keep pace with the progress of theological science in this enlightened age. Such appeared to be the specious design. And to carry out this design, new theories were proposed, and new measures introduced, and we were threatened with the entire subversion of the whole system of evangelical truth, which we had always been taught to regard as essential to true Christianity. But we have reason to thank God, that this danger has, in a great measure, passed away. There has been a reaction of late years, which has brought back many, who were led astray, to the original doctrines and principles of our Church, and, however much those principles may have been misrepresented, and assailed, they are daily becoming more firmly established in the minds of true Lutherans who love their Church, and her noble testimony for the truth.

ciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." Heb. 2: 16-18. This Scriptural idea of the "Communicatio idiomatum" is fully expressed in our symbols, and lies at the foundation of the Christology of the Lutheran Church. We hold, that Christ is present with his people in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, not because he possesses in his humanity the divine attribute of Omnipresence, but because his humanity is so closely and inseparably connected with his Deity, that wherever he is divinely present, he must also be necessarily present in his humanity. As Mediator he is always present at the throne of God in both natures, making intercession for us. All evangelical Christians believe this on the ground, that the divine and human natures are inseparable in the person of our exalted Redeemer. Why not, for the same reason, admit our doctrine of the spiritual and bodily presence of Christ in the sacred mystery of the communion table, where he says to his people, "Take, eat, this is my body, given for you; Drink ye all of this cup, for this is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins." If we taught that Christ were present at the Eucharist at the same time, in all places, where the ordinance is celebrated, in his human nature, disconnected from his divine presence, we would be guilty of an absurdity; because no being, purely human, can be present in different localities at the same time. It is an impossibility. But we teach no such doctrine. We say, that Christ is present at the ordinance of the Lord's Supper in his human *through* the divine nature, and necessarily so, because both natures are so connected in his person, as to be *inseparable*. This is our doctrine, and this is no more unreasonable, than the presence of Christ in his two-fold nature, when the Sacrament of the Eucharist was first instituted. If Christ were only to manifest himself to his people in the holy communion by a spiritual presence as God, it might afford them much consolation and encouragement; but they could not feel the sympathy and joy of communion with "God manifest in the *flesh*;" and even with a brother, who can be touched with the feeling of their infirmities, who was tempted in all things like themselves, and who is able to succor them in all their weaknesses and temptations. They might receive some benefit from his person and sacrifice as a divine Saviour, but it would not be a participation in all his *fulness* as God-man. It would be a divided Christ, Christ over all, God

blessed for ever; but not Emmanuel, God with us. We hold that the promise which the Saviour made to his disciples when he was about to ascend into heaven, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world," is literally fulfilled by his presence at the communion table; and that this is a necessary result of the inseparable connexion of the divine and human natures in the unity of his person.*

After all the attempts of theological writers in ancient and modern times to explain this hypostatic union of two natures in Christ, it must be confessed, that it is a mystery incomprehensible to human reason.† We receive the doc-

*The Lutheran Church has not adopted the Romish doctrine of *Transubstantiation* on the subject of the Lord's Supper. We do not believe that the elements of bread and wine are changed by the mere ceremonies of clerical consecration, into the body and blood of Christ; neither do we hold to *Consubstantiation* in the sense that term is often applied to us. We say the bread and wine remain the same in substance after the consecration, that they were before; that they are "external signs" of the body and blood of Christ, given to us to eat and drink, and that Christ is present in this ordinance communicating himself to his people, through the participation of his body and blood, in a mysterious and incomprehensible manner. The Lutheran view of the real presence of Christ at the Eucharist is clearly stated by *Sartorius*, one of our most eminent theological writers, in the following comprehensive and expressive words: "The Saviour could, indeed, have been always, and everywhere spiritually present with his disciples in his divine nature; but this general universal, incomprehensible presence could not at all indemnify them for his peculiar, definitely circumscribed human presence. Moreover, it was not only as God he desired to be present with them, but he also desired constantly to communicate himself to them as the God-man, as Mediator, to give himself to them as their own, and to receive them in communion with himself. This could not be effected through divine omnipresence; and, therefore, he appointed, or established in the Sacred Supper, a special divine-human presence of himself in his Church, when he says in the most explicit words, respecting the bread of the altar, 'This is my body;' and respecting the wine, 'This is my blood.' Not as though a transmutation of the bread and wine into his body and blood took place, as the Romish Church teaches. By no means. As in the incarnation of the Son of God, human nature was not transmuted into Deity—no more, are bread and wine converted into the substance of Christ. But as there, so here, there is only an intimate union, which is, indeed, supersensuous, but yet real and substantial according to the promise of Christ."

†This is often urged as an objection to our doctrine. To show the fallacy of the objection, we quote a remark of *Dr. Dwight* from his Sermon on the Incarnation of Christ, "When the Arians will explain how their superangelic being became the infant, and ultimately the man Jesus Christ, and suffered, and died, and accomplished the things ascribed of Christ; when the Socinians will explain how he, who was created by the Holy Ghost, was born of *Joseph* and *Mary*, how organized matter thinks—how he who began to exist at his birth, existed ante-

trine, and believe it, simply upon the evidence of divine revelation. We know that the word was made flesh—that the Son of God assumed our nature in a supernatural and miraculous manner, and that in the nature he thus assumed, he was born, lived, suffered, and died. We know and believe this, because it is a revealed truth of God's word. But how he, who was in the form of God, and equal with God, was found in the fashion of a man; how these two natures, so vastly and essentially different, were united in the person of Emmanuel, we cannot comprehend. We do not even pretend to understand and explain this great truth, which infinitely surpasses our finite understanding. It is a mystery that angels desire to look into. And when men attempt to fathom the mystery, and take it upon themselves to reject, because they cannot understand it, they evince their folly and wickedness. Let those who lay profane hands upon this mystery—who treat it with contempt, and even turn it into ridicule, beware, lest God do unto them as he did to the men of Bethshemesh, whom he smote for looking into the Ark. The incarnation of the Son of God is, indeed, a mystery; but it is just such a mystery as God in his infinite wisdom saw was necessary for the accomplishment of his gracious and glorious purposes in the restoration of our fallen race.

This mysterious union of the divine and human natures in the person of our adorable Saviour had for its object great ends, which could not have been accomplished without it. One of its designs was to satisfy the demands of divine Justice, and make an atonement for the sins of the world. This was a great work—a work which could only be performed by the Son of God in the character of a Mediator between God and man, possessing both natures. It was necessary that the satisfaction for sin should be rendered in the same nature in which the offense was committed. The righteousness of God required this. Man had sinned, consequently, man must suffer punishment—man must die. Therefore Christ assumed the nature of man. In that nature he suffered the penalty of sin, satisfied the demands of

cedently in the form of God; emptied himself, and was then born in the likeness of men, and when both, or either of them will explain how the things said in the Scriptures concerning Christ are true, and at the same time consistent with their respective schemes; or how God could say them if they were not true, I think, I may venture upon an attempt to explain the mystery of the Incarnation." *Dwight's Theology, New York Edition, Vol. 2, p. 53.*

the law by his obedience, and gave himself as a sacrifice on the cross. But this was not all that was required to render the sacrifice available. It was necessary that the sacrifice for sin should be infinitely meritorious, or God could not accept it. Such an offering man could not render. Christ, therefore, must also possess a divine nature, so that by his obedience and sufferings in our stead, he might render a sacrifice of infinite value; a sacrifice that God could accept for the satisfaction of his law, and the salvation of sinners. Such a sacrifice Christ did render in his two-fold nature as God-man. As man, he obeyed the law, and suffered its penalty. As God he could not suffer. He suffered in his human nature, but still in connexion with his divine nature. And this mysterious union of the human with the divine nature in the person of the suffering Son of God, rendered the sacrifice so inconceivably meritorious, that it was sufficient to purchase the salvation of the whole world. "For such a person," says Archbishop Usher, "to have suffered but *one hour*, was more than if all other persons had suffered *ten thousand millions of years*." Luther in his Confession respecting the Lord's Supper says, "If I believe that the human nature only has suffered for me, then is Christ for me an insufficient Saviour; nay, he even needs a Saviour for himself." In the Formula of Concord, one of our symbols, our Church declares, "We believe that not a mere man only suffered for us, but a man, whose human nature has with the Son of God so intimate and inexpressible a union and communion, that it has become one person with him."

Another important result flowing from the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ is his *intercession* for his people at the throne of his Father in heaven. If there were no medium of access for believers to the throne of God, they must for ever be excluded from it; for they are sinners, and as such could not stand in the presence of God. They could not be admitted in their own name for they have nothing to recommend them to the favor of their righteous Judge. But in Christ, they have an intercessor, a High Priest, who has assumed their nature, so that he can sympathize with them, and effectually plead for them. He is their brother, in close and intimate communion with them, having an unchangeable priesthood." Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him." Through his blood he has opened a way of admittance into the presence of God and he now invites them

to come through this way, that he may help in every time of need. This is one of the benefits resulting to believers from the mediatorial character and office of Christ as God and man. All his acts as Mediator have been and are still performed in this character. As God, he knew the divine will and purposes from all eternity. As man, he revealed them in time, as his Father taught him. He shed his blood in his human nature, but in both his divine and human natures, he rendered an infinitely meritorious and all-sufficient sacrifice. He rules over his Church with the delegated power of a man, contending against his enemies and even suffering them for a while to prevail against him, but with the mighty power of God he will finally subdue all these enemies, and bring them to submission. These are the ends and purposes of the incarnation and Mediatorship of Christ, and all these ends and purposes are promoted, and will be finally accomplished through the union and co-operation of two natures, human and divine, in one person.*

The incarnation of the eternal Word is a mystery, in which God has given us a greater display of his love and wisdom, than in all his other works. There are other mysteries connected with his Providence and works, which excite our admiration and astonishment. But here is the great mystery which excels all others in its magnitude and impor-

*The delegated power and authority of Christ's Mediatorship which were given to him for the subjugation and final overthrow of his enemies, will cease, when all opposition to his government shall have been overcome. After the day of Judgment, God the Son will deliver up his mediatorial kingdom to God the Father, from whom he received it. "Then shall the Son also be subject unto him," God the Father; but even then, after the termination of his mediatorial kingdom, Christ will continue to reign as the King of glory, by virtue of the power and majesty which were inherent in him from the beginning, as Creator and Governor of all things. When the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ, when all the purposes of Christ's incarnation and Mediatorship shall have been accomplished he shall reign as King of saints for ever.

Marcellus, a false teacher, about the time when the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds were published, denied the eternity of Christ's kingdom. He taught that after the final Judgment, Christ, the Word and his kingdom would revert to God the Father, and entirely cease. To guard against this heresy, the Greek Fathers inserted in their Creeds the words of the Angel who announced the birth of Christ to the Virgin Mary "Ὁ ἡς Βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος" "Of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 1: 33. These words were spoken from heaven and placed on the record of divine inspiration, a perpetual memento of the eternity of Christ's kingdom and reign.

tance. Here is a way devised by infinite wisdom for the salvation of a lost world—a method of deliverance for a fallen and ruined race that calls forth the admiration of angels and fills all heaven with astonishment and rapture. When there was no eye to pity and no arm to save—when there was no created being in the whole universe that could redeem lost man from the condemnation, and ruin, in which sin had involved him, the Son of God offered himself, and said, "Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God." He gave himself as a sacrifice; and in this mysterious sacrifice of the Lord of glory, who was crucified for the salvation of sinners, we see the love and wisdom of God most wonderfully displayed. We see here a display of divine wisdom, which rises far above the highest and noblest intellect, that ever existed, or shall exist in the mind of a created being. We see Jesus Christ, the eternal Word, by whom the worlds were made, born of a woman, laid in a manger, hanging on the cross, bleeding, suffering and dying for rebellious, guilty, perishing worms. His name is called Wonderful. And is it not wonderful that God should provide for us a Saviour in the flesh, so nearly allied to us, so humble, compassionate and meek, that he was willing to take upon himself our burden, and bear our sins; and yet so mighty in his divine power, that he is "able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him?"

God was manifest in the flesh to take away sin, to redeem and purify unto himself a peculiar people, a body of believers from all nations who will serve, praise and glorify him for ever. For this purpose he humbled himself; and for this end, he has also been exalted. He has been raised from the dead and ascended the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, for the accomplishment of all the purposes of his manifestation in the flesh. Having been made an offering for sin he shall see his seed. He shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied. The great mass of mankind, for whom Christ died, are living in the world, as if no Saviour had been provided for them. The multitude are in the broad way to destruction. They tread under foot the Son of God, and do despite unto the Spirit of his grace. It is, indeed, lamentable that among those whom Christ came to save, there are so many, who are seemingly left to perish. Still Christ will have his seed. God will give him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.

Though not one of those, who now reject his offer of mercy, should ever be saved, Christ shall see the travail of his soul. He shall reap the fruits of his humiliation and sufferings. The Saviour will be honored. He will be glorified and exalted by the achievements of his grace and the trophies of his love in heaven, when they who have refused to submit to the terms of his salvation shall be cast down to hell to suffer his eternal wrath and indignation.

Christ is entitled to the veneration, worship, gratitude and love of his people, whom he has redeemed by his blood. Christians should never forget their obligations to honor him for his excellent character, his glorious perfections, his Almighty power, his infinite wisdom, and unbounded love. They should honor him for his eternal power and Godhead, his mysterious incarnation, his humiliation, sufferings, and death, his glorious resurrection, and ascension into heaven. Let all who profess to believe in him, and to have found an interest in his blood, honor him by faithfully serving him, walking in the way of his commandments, keeping his covenant, building up his kingdom in their own hearts, and the hearts of others around them. Thus shall they be prepared to join that holy throng of worshippers in the upper Sanctuary, who praise and magnify his name for ever, saying, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

ARTICLE IV.

LUTHER'S BATTLE-SONG OF THE REFORMATION.

By W. M. REYNOLDS, D. D., Chicago, Illinois.

Of all the weapons wielded by Luther in the great warfare of the Reformation none were more effective than his hymns. By these, at least, was realized what the illustrious Sidney has said of songs in general, "*Let me make a nation's songs, and I care not who makes its laws.*" Charles V., though the mightiest monarch of his age, could make no

laws that exercised such an influence over the souls of those whom he called his subjects, as the "*Es ist das Heil uns kommen her*," of Paul Speratus, Schneessing's "*Allein zu dir Herr Jesus Christ*," or Luther's "*Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*." To Luther's hymns especially we may apply what a recent writer has said of the German hymns of this period generally: "The intricate intertwinings of rhyme and the lingering cadences of the later mediæval hymns vanish, and the inspiring decision of martial music rings through them once more. They are songs to march to, reviving the fainting strength after many an hour of weary journeying; blasts of the priests' trumpets, before which many a stronghold has fallen; chants of trust and of triumph, which must often have reverberated from the very gates of heaven, as they accompanied the departing spirit thither, and mingled with the new song of the great multitude inside."^{*}

But of all his hymns his "*Ein' feste Burg*" undoubtedly breathes most of the spirit, and displays most of the power of Luther. It is a true picture of his simple faith in Christ, and of his immovable trust in God, his forgetfulness of self, and entire consecration of his life and all that he held dear to that Saviour who, he doubted not, would speedily, gloriously, and forever triumph over Satan and all his hosts, by that word which he was the honored instrument once more to proclaim to the world.

Thomas Carlyle has, indeed, said, "With words Luther had not learned to make pure music; it was by deeds of love, or heroic valor, that he spake freely; in tones, only through his flute, amid tears, could the sigh of that strong soul find utterance." But the judgment of three centuries, which have continued to ponder Luther's writings and to sing enraptured upon the undying reverberation of his accents, may be regarded as a sufficient answer to this dictum of the eccentric philosopher. There is, however, much truth, as well as beauty, in what he immediately adds: "Nevertheless, though in imperfect articulation, the same voice, if we will listen well, is to be heard also in his writings, in his poems. The following [*"Ein' feste Burg,"*] for example, jars upon our ears; yet is there something in it like the sound of Alpine avalanches, or the first murmur of earthquakes; in the very vastness of which dissonance a higher unison is revealed to us. Luther wrote this song in a time of blackest threatenings, which, however, could in no

^{*}"The Voice of Christian Life in Song," p. 221.

wise become a time of despair. In these tones, rugged, broken as they are, we do but recognize the accents of that summoned man (summoned, not by Charles V. but by God Almighty also), who answered his friend's warning not to enter Worms, in this wise: "*Were there as many devils in Worms as there are roof-tiles, I would on;*"—of him who, alone in that assemblage, before all emperors, and principalities, and powers, spoke forth those final and forever memorable words: "*It is neither safe nor prudent, to do aught against conscience. Here stand I, I cannot otherwise, God assist me, Amen!*"

Carlyle seems here to take it for granted, as so many others have done, that this celebrated hymn was written just before the diet of Worms in 1521. Peter Busch first distinctly maintained this view in a special work entitled "*Historie und Erklärung des Helden-Liedes Lutheri* (History and Exposition of Luther's Heroic Song), published in 1731, where he also asserts that it was composed by Luther at Oppenheim, whilst on his way to Worms. His principal evidence for this is, that the beginning of the third stanza agrees so nearly with the words which he wrote from that place to Spalatin: "I will go to Worms, if there are as many devils there as there are tiles upon the houses." But, as is well observed by Wackernagel ("*Martin Luther's Geistliche Lieder*," p. 157), Luther's letter to Spalatin is not from Oppenheim, but from Frankfort, and the passage in question reads thus: "But Christ lives, and we will enter Worms though all the gates of hell and powers of the air should oppose us."* An examination of the first editions of Luther's hymn books also reveals the fact that none of these, down to the year 1528, contains this hymn. This fact being established, the position was thenceforward taken by most writers upon the subject, that this hymn was composed by Luther during his sojourn in the castle of Coburg, amid the exciting scenes of the diet of Augsburg in 1530. This view was confirmed by the high authorities of Sleidan, Weller, Coelestin and Chytraeus. Sleidan's statement is very positive, and stands at the close of the 16th book of his Commentaries in these words: "After the Emperor's inauguration by Pope Clement, whilst he was holding a diet at Augsburg, a horrible tempest seemed to impend; but Luther continued both in private and public to console his friends,

*"*Verum Christus vivit, et intrabimus Wormatiam, invitis omnibus portis inferni, et potentatibus aeris.*"

employing for this purpose the forty-ninth Psalm." Whereupon he proceeds to give a very fine prose version (Latin) of Luther's hymn, after which he also says, "Adapting, as I have said, this Psalm to that time so full of sorrow and anxiety, having translated it into the language of the people, and giving a suitable turn to the ideas, he also versified and set it to music, very appropriate to the subject and suited to the awakening of courage. Hence the Psalm has continued to be frequently sung from that day even to the present."

This was written in 1550, only four years after Luther's death, by one who was personally acquainted with Luther's associates, and likely to be well informed upon the subject. Yet there is no doubt that Sleidan was mistaken as to the time and occasion of the writing of this hymn. We are assured upon unquestionable authority, that this hymn was contained in an edition of Luther's hymns published at Wittenberg by Joseph Klug in 1529. It is true, no copy of this book is now known to exist, but a very particular account of it is given in the fifth volume of the "*Journal von und für Deutschland*," of the year 1788, p. 328 of Part Second, where we are informed that the book bears the date of its publication (1529) both on its title page and on its last page. All this is very minutely explained by Wackernagel in his beautiful edition of Luther's hymns (Stuttgart 1848), where he also concludes his acknowledgment of the mistake that he had formerly made, in the following terms: "It is, indeed, hard for us to relinquish the idea that this hymn was composed at Coburg during the sitting of the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. * * But we must make up our minds to this, and must hereafter think of the Diet of Spires in connection with this hymn." p. 93.

Authors so intelligent and so careful having fallen into such a mistake, it is the less surprising that the genial and lively, but not very careful or profound, D'Aubigné, should have followed them without hesitation. But he goes still further, and details all the circumstances under which the hymn and its tune were first composed and sung. "John," he says,* "began his journey on the 3d of April, with one hundred and sixty horsemen, clad in rich scarlet cloaks, embroidered with gold. Every man was aware of the dangers which threatened the Elector, and hence many of his escort marched with down-cast eyes and sinking hearts. But Lu-

*History of the Great Reformation, &c., Vol. IV. p. 139. New York: Robert Carter—1846.

ther, full of faith, revived the courage of his friends, by composing, and singing with his fine voice that beautiful hymn, since become so famous: *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*—"Our God is a strong tower."* Never did soul that knew its own weakness, but which, looking to God, despises every fear, find such noble accents.

"With our own strength we naught can do,
Destruction yawns on every side:
He fights for us, our champion true,
Elect of God to be our guide.
What is his name? Th' Anointed One,
The God of Armies he;
Of earth and heav'n the Lord alone—
With him, on field of battle won,
Abideth Victory."

This hymn was sung during the Diet not only at Augsburg, but in all the churches of Saxony, and its energetic strains were often seen to revive and inspirit the most dejected minds."

Making every allowance for the vividness of his imagination, it is still difficult to understand how D'Aubigné could fail to see the inconsistencies of this statement. To say nothing of the improbability of Luther not only composing a hymn and tune, but also teaching them to his companions amid the bustle and excitement of such a journey, how can we conceive that copies of both should be so widely diffused as to admit of their being sung at once in "Augsburg, and in all the churches of Saxony!" The statement that they were so sung is, no doubt, correct, but from this it follows almost inevitably, that both the hymn and its tune had been composed long before, as in this way alone can we account for their wide diffusion and common use among all the adherents to the Reformation. Their publication in 1829 removes all these difficulties.

But not only the date of publication, but likewise the words of the hymn and, of course, the notes of the tune have been variously given. In the latter case, however, the discrepancies are not very serious. Some of the variations in the text are merely the difference between the older and more modern forms of German words, as "*stan*," for "*stahn*," or "*stehen*," and the like. More important is the addition of a sixth syllable to the fifth line of every stanza by changing in the first "*der alt' böse Feind*," into "*der alte böse Feind*;"

*We have attempted a very feeble translation of the second stanza.

in the second, "*Fragst du, wer der ist,*" into "*Fragest du, wer der ist;*" in the third, "*der Fürst dieser Welt,*" into "*der Fürste dieser Welt,*" and in the fourth, "*nehmen sie den Leib,*" into "*nehmen sie uns den Leib.*" Of course, an additional note had to be inserted in the music to correspond to such a text. It is very difficult to account for this variation which is found as far back as 1540, in the Magdeburg Hymn Book, in Kugelman's "*Tenor Concentus Novi, Augsburg, 1540,*" George Rhaw's "*Bicinia, Wittenberg, 1545,*" and several others of the same early period. Had this change been extended to the following lines, viz: the sixth and seventh of each stanza, it would have been consistent, and the improvement manifest, as the irregular and rough lines of five syllables might thus have been converted into iambs of six syllables, and thus made to agree with the eighth line as the laws of rhythm manifestly require that they should do. It was, probably, an intuitive sense of this that started either Luther, or some one else possessed of a musical ear, in the right direction, but either haste, or the force of authority, prevented its being carried out consistently. The text as written by Luther, put into modern German orthography, is, therefore, no doubt, given correctly by Wilhelm Schirks ("*Dr. Martin Luther's geistliche Lieder. Nach den Originaltexten etc. Halle, Verlag von Julius Fricke. 1854,*" as follows:

1. Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott,
ein gute Wehr und Waffen.
Er hilft uns frei aus aller Noth,
die uns jetzt hat betroffen.
Der alt böse Feind
mit Ernst ers jetzt meint,
gross Macht und viel List
sein grausam Rüstung ist,
auf Erd ist nicht seins Gleichen.
2. Mit unsrer Macht ist nichts gethan,
wir sind gar bald verloren!
Es streit' für uns der rechte Mann,
den Gott hat selbst erkoren.
Fragst du, wer der ist?
er heisst Jesus Christ,
der Herr Zebaoth,
und ist kein andrer Gott,
das Feld muss er behalten.
3. Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär,
und wollt uns gar verschlingen,
so fürchten wir uns nicht so sehr,
es soll uns doch gelingen.

Der Fürst dieser Welt,
wie saur er sich stellt,
thut er uns doch nichts,
das macht, er ist gericht't,
Ein Wörtlein kann ihn fallen.

4. Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn,
und kein Dank dazu haben.
Er ist bei uns wohl auf dem Plan
mit seinem Geist und Gaben.
Nehmen sie den Leib,
Gut, Ehr, Kind, und Weib,
lass fahren dahin,
sie habens kein Gewinn,
Das Reich muss uns doch bleiben.

The Strasburg Hymn Book of 1545 appends the following doxology, which, however, has no claim to be considered as Luther's composition:

Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn,
und auch dem Heil'gen Geiste,
als es im Anfang war und nun,
der uns sein Gnade leiste,
Dass wir überall
hier im Jammerthal
von Sünden abstohn
und seinen Willen thun:
wer das begehrt, sprech, Amen.

There is no difference of opinion as to the authorship of the tune, Luther being universally admitted to be its composer, although some envious Romanist has claimed both this and the words as the work of an orthodox Catholic. It is true, however, that the hymn was for a long time sung by devout Romanists as well as by the most ardent Protestants. It was also a favorite devotional piece with Luther, who is reported to have sung it daily in the castle of Coburg whilst he was anxiously awaiting the action of the Augsburg Diet of 1530. But this, as we have already shown, by no means implies that the hymn was written at Coburg.

Like all the early Lutheran hymns, this was speedily translated into the languages of most of the countries into which Protestantism penetrated during the sixteenth century. Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Bohemia, Hungary, and wherever else Lutheran ideas became dominant, received it as a part of their confession of faith, along with the Augustana and the Short Catechism. That it did not make its appearance in England is no more difficult to explain than the absence of anything like an original, national psalmody from

the first four centuries of English literature. Even now, three hundred years after the English race has become essentially Protestant, and second to no other in the depth and fervor of its religious character, with which also its literature is thoroughly imbued—still we have no great body of sacred songs which is claimed as their common treasure by those who speak the language not merely upon the little island where it has originated, but as mighty nations in America, Australia, Africa and India. The genial author of "*The Voice of Christian Life in Song*," has undertaken to explain this singular phenomenon in our national and religious life, so far as the first two centuries after the Reformation are concerned, but he entirely overlooks the main fact of the almost entire absence, even to the present day, of a truly national English psalmody, to which we have just referred. He ascribes it to the Calvinistic ideal of external church-forms, that is to say, that there was to be nothing in the service of the Church which was not distinctly set forth in the New Testament; or, as he states the case more fully:

"When we remember that the same absence of an evangelical hymn literature, springing up spontaneously as a natural growth of the Reformation, which characterizes the Reformed churches of France and French Switzerland, exists also in the sister Church of Scotland, it is impossible not to connect this fact with the similar form which the Reformation took in all these lands. None of the strictly Calvinistic communities have a Hymn Book dating back to the Reformation. It cannot surely be their doctrine which caused this; many of the best known and most deeply treasured of the more modern hymns of Germany and England have been written by those who receive the doctrines known as Calvinistic. Nor can it proceed from any peculiarity of race, or deficiency in popular love of music and song. French and Scotch national character are too dissimilar to explain the resemblance; whilst France has many national melodies and songs, and Scotland is peculiarly rich in both. Is not the cause then simply the common ideal of external ecclesiastical forms which pervaded all the Churches reformed on the Genevan type? The intervening chapters of Church history were, as it were, folded up, as too blotted and marred for the truth to be read to profit in them; and, next to the first chapter in the Acts of the Apostles, was to stand, as the second chapter, the history of the Reformed Churches." pp. 253, 254.

But how inapplicable this is to the Episcopal Church of England, the author from whom we have just quoted, is evidently conscious, for he immediately proceeds to explain a similar state of things there, where, "between Anglicanism and Puritanism it happened that, until the last century, we can not be said to have had any national, that is, any people's hymn book at all." p. 255. Here, we think, he stumbles upon the real cause of the phenomenon, we mean the want of common ideas and feelings, habits and modes of action, that is to say, of national unity in the English race. The various races, of which it is composed, have not yet perfectly coalesced and been fully blended into one, as is sufficiently manifest in its spoken as well as in its written language, in its social, political and religious institutions. The Celt, the Roman, the Saxon, the Dane, the Norman, with various other still later accretions, continue to assert an independent existence in English national life, instead of combining, as they will, doubtless, ultimately do, into one indivisible and perfect organism. Hence we have in government the Monarchist and the Republican, the Aristocrat and Socialist, the Regicides, and those who canonise Charles I. as a martyr; and in religion, the Episcopalian, the Independent, the Presbyterian and the Methodist, the Quaker and the Baptist, to say nothing of the Romanist and the Unitarian. How could all these discordant, not to say antagonistic, ideas, in the midst of their fierce contests and earthquake-like heavings unite in one song of heavenly harmony? Doubtless they will at length unite, even as the earthly elements have done, after the long and terrible convulsions of nature, depositing and upheaving strata upon strata, and changing the places of seas and continents. But it is long after the flash of the lightning and the shock of the earthquake, by which these changes were brought about, that their place as notes in the grand harmony of the music of the spheres becomes manifest to the mind of man. So, in these intellectual and moral movements of our race, time is required to harmonize them, and enable all who are at once actors and spectators in this grand drama to raise the same song of praise to the Great Father and common Redeemer of all.

It is remarkable, however, that as soon as any thing like a hymn literature makes its appearance in the English language, it at once allies itself to German psalmody, and gives translation after translation of Luther's celebrated hymn, from which we have made this digression. Thus John Wesley, whose

influence has been so powerful in giving to England "a People's Hymn Book," not only acknowledges his indebtedness to Luther and the Moravians for many of the elements of his new life, but actually translates most of his hymns from the German; models, too, they are of translation, and wanting only one element, that of their rich and varied rhythm and metre, to transfer to our tongue and give citizenship to the hymns of Germany in England. So also Montgomery, one of the sweetest and most correct of English hymn-writers, was educated among the Moravians, and undoubtedly formed his taste and style to a very great extent by the German melodies, which he heard among them, though in a very imperfect articulation in English.

But coterminously with the Wesleys, and whilst they were preparing their hymn books, Jacobi, Haberkorn, and other authors of "*Psalmodia Germanica*"* were (1760-1765) translating a large body of standard German hymns "*together with their proper tunes and Thorough Bass*," that is to say, in the exact metres of their originals. Among these, of course, is a version of Luther's immortal psalm. But, strange to say, this is one of the few instances in which the original metre is tampered with. Not only is the false form of placing six syllables instead of five in the fifth line, adopted, but this is extended to the sixth and seventh lines also. We give an exact reprint of this as it stands in the edition of the "*Psalmodia Germanica*," printed by Haberkorn in London in 1765, with which is also identical the 96th hymn of Dr. Kunze's "*Hymn and Prayer Book*, New York 1795," but which was probably taken from the edition which Dr. Kunze (in his Preface p. 5) tells us was "reprinted at New York by H. Paine, 1765."

God is our refuge in distress,
Our strong defence and armour,
He's present when we're comfortless,
In storms he is our harbour,
Th' infernal enemy,
Look! how enrag'd is he!
He now exerts his force
To stop the Gospel course:
Who can withstand this Tyrant?

All human power is but dust;
Our strength an idle story;

*For a brief account of this work see Article on "English Hymnology," in the *Ecological Review*, Vol. VII. pp. 445-446.

The *Valiant Man*, in whom we trust,
Is Christ, the Lord of Glory.
He is the Conqueror,
Vested with sovereign pow'r.
The Lord both great and good,
The only living God
Gains us the field of battle.

If all the devils should wage the war,
In order to destroy us,
They should not once put us in fear;
The vict'ry would be joyous.
We dare the prince of hell;
With fury let him swell;
He cannot hurt one hair;
We shall escape his snare;
CHRIST'S single word can rout him.

His word puts all our foes to flight;
With shame they are confounded;
For CHRIST instructs our hands to fight;
His Spirit is unbounded;
Tho' we should lose our lives,
Fame, children, goods and wives,
Destroy hell what it can
Twill find but little gain,
God's kingdom is our portion.

Except in the defective metre already mentioned, this is a fair specimen of the translations of the *Psalmodia Germanica*, which, of course, fell far short of the popular demand for language, when Milton, Addison, Pope and Johnson had so highly polished, invigorated and harmonized the once rude English, and Sternhold and Hopkins were displaced by Watts, and the Wesleys, Toplady, Newton and Cowper were preparing to utter more musical strains than had hitherto been heard in English hymns. So far as we are aware, however, this is the first attempt at rendering "*Ein' feste Burg*" into English, unless F. Okeley, who translated Count Zinzendorff's "*Twenty-one Discourses or Dissertations upon the Augsburg Confession*," printed in London in 1753, may have translated the whole psalm along with the second stanza, which he gives as in a note on page 134, as follows:

"By our own strength there's nothing done,
We soon are lost and marred;
But there fights for us the right man,
Whom God himself prepared:
Askest thou for his name?
'Tis Jesus Christ; the same
Who's Lord of Hosts indeed,
And there's no God beside;
He sure must win the battle."

Judging by the style of versification we should place this in a period considerably anterior to the version in the *Psalmodia Ger.* But this is not a perfectly reliable criterion, as we find similar harsh constructions and doggerel rhymes in a translation of this hymn, published as late as 1853 in London. It stands on pages 181 and 182 of that otherwise beautiful reproduction in English of Gustav König's "*Life of Martin Luther, the German Reformer, in Fifty Pictures, &c., London: Nathaniel Cooke, Milford House, Strand, 1853.*" (Republished in this country by Lindsay & Blakiston, Phil., with an Introduction by T. Stork, D. D.)

Very different is the version of this Psalm given by Thomas Carlyle in his "*Heroes and Hero Worship*," published about the year 1838. This translation has fewer of the blemishes of Carlyle's peculiar style, and more of his genuine Anglo Saxon vigor than his prose writings generally exhibit. We have already given the remarks, by which he introduces it, and now append the version itself:

A safe stronghold our God is still,
A trusty shield and weapon:
He'll help us clear from all the ill
That hath us now o'ertaken.
The ancient prince of hell,
Hath risen with purpose fell;
Strong mail of craft and power
He weareth in this hour,
On earth is not his fellow.

With force of arms we nothing can,
Full soon were we downriden;
But for us fights the proper man,
Whom God himself hath bidden.
Ask ye, Who is this same?
Christ Jesus is his name,
The Lord Zebaoth's Son,
He and no other one
Shall conquer in the battle.

And were this world all devils o'er
And watching to devour us,
We lay it not to heart so sore,
Not they can overpower us.
And let the prince of ill
Look grim as ere he will,
He harms us not a whit.
For why? His doom is writ
A word shall quickly slay him.

God's Word for all their craft and force,
One moment will not linger,

But spite of hell shall have its course,
'Tis written by his finger.
And tho' they take our life,
Goods, honor, children, wife,
Yet is their profit small;
These things shall vanish all,
The City of God remaineth.

It was on this version of Carlyle that the hymn (No. 966 in the Lutheran collection of the General Synod, since 1850) was based, only such changes being made (in the fifth, sixth and seventh lines especially) as were necessary to adapt it to the old melody, as well as to remove some expressions not regarded as suited to public worship. But this "patching of the old garment with a new piece," has not made a very smooth or homogeneous version, although it approached nearer to the original form than any translation then known. About the same time, however, Dr. Henry Mills (now Professor Emeritus in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Auburn, N. Y.,) published (1844) the following excellent version of this hymn, which was undoubtedly the first English translation that successfully and faithfully reproduced the exact metrical form of the original:

1. A tow'r of safety is our God,
His sword and shield defend us;
His mercy too relieves the load
Of evils that attend us.
But the ancient foe
Strives to work our woe;
Fearful power and art
In him their force exert,—
On earth he has no rival.
2. By strength of ours naught could be done,—
The strife full soon were ended;
But fights for us the righteous One
By God himself commended.
Needs his name be told?
Jesus—from of old
Lord of Sabaoth,—
Our God and Saviour both,—
He shall our souls deliver.
3. Though devils all the earth should fill,
Each gaping to devour us,
The Saviour would our terrors quell,
And vict'ry guide before us,
Prince of this vain world,
Be thy fury hurl'd

On our heads!—'twere vain!
 He will thy rage restrain,
 His smallest word subdue thee.

4. His truth our foes shall help to show,—
 For this no thanks they merit;—
 Believing him we onward go,
 He cheers us by his Spirit;
 Should they, in the strife,
 Quench our joys and life;—
 When their work is done,
 For us the vict'ry's won—
 He'll crown us then with glory!

Like most of Dr. Mills' translations, this is very faithful to the spirit of the original, but departs very far from its letter; the verification, too, is generally correct, and, in this case, not inferior to the original which is, undoubtedly, one of the roughest, that Luther has produced.

The next version of this hymn that has come to our notice is that of Miss Catharine Winkworth in her well known "*Lyra Germanica*," which was first published in 1855. This work has undoubtedly given a new impulse and direction to the study and use of German hymns among the various branches of the English race. The two volumes of this kind which Miss Winkworth has published are, certainly, to be ranked among the most delightful devotional works of a lyrical character in the English language. Had Miss Winkworth taken more pains to reproduce the metres of the original, her translations might have marked a new epoch in English hymnology and church music, and could scarcely have failed to take their place as standard works in this department of literature. We can by no means agree with her in the reasons which she assigns (in the Preface to the first volume of her "*Lyra Germanica*" p. 17, for this departure from the originals: "In translating these hymns," she says, "the original form has been retained with the exception, that single rhymes are almost invariably substituted for the double rhymes which the structure of the language renders so common in German poetry, but which become cloying to an English ear when often repeated; and that English double common or short metre is used instead of what may be called the German common metre, the same that we call Gay's stanza, which is scarcely solemn enough for sacred purposes." This last is certainly a singular objection to German metres—that they are "not solemn enough for sacred purposes!"—the general objection to German tunes

being that they are too short and not lively enough. Neither can we admit it as a fact that "double rhymes become cloying to the English ear," as long as "*From Greenland's icy mountains*" remains one of our most popular hymns. Her translation of "*Ein' feste Burg*" is not the best specimen of her skill, and its departures from the original metre are not recommended by superior smoothness. It stands, on p. 173 of Stanford's New York edition of the first series of the *Lyra Germanica*, as follows :

God is our stronghold firm and sure,
Our trusty shield and weapon,
He shall deliver us, whate'er
Of ill to us may happen.
Our ancient enemy
In earnest now is he,
Much craft and great might,
Arm him for the fight,
On earth is not his fellow.

Our might is naught but weakness, soon
Should we the battle lose,
But for us fights the rightful man
Whom God himself doth choose.
Askest thou his name ?
'Tis Jesus Christ, the same
Whom Lord of hosts we call,
God only over all ;
None from the field can drive him.

What though the world were full of fiends,
That would us sheer devour !
We know we yet shall win the day,
We fear not all their power,
The prince of this world still
May struggle as he will,
He nothing can prevail
A word shall make him quail,
For he is judged of heaven.

The word of God they shall not touch,
Yet have no thanks therefor,
God by his Spirit and his gifts,
Is with us in the war.
Then let them take our life,
Goods, honor, children, wife,
Though naught of these we save
Small profit shall they have,
The kingdom our abideth.

About the same time as Miss Winkworth, R. Massie, Esq., published his translation of this along with the other hymns of

Luther, which we are sorry not to have seen. Judging from Miss Winkworth's favorable notice (in the Preface to the second series of her *Lyra Germanica*, p. X.), as well as from his translations of Spitta's hymns, we presume that they must have considerable merit.

We are also in ignorance of the date of the following translation of our hymn by Dr. W. L. Alexander. We find it in the "*Lyra Christiana*," a beautiful little volume, published in "Edinburg by John Maclaren," without either data or the name of its editor. His slight departure from the original metre in the fifth line is less remarkable than his careful adherence to it elsewhere. The translation as a whole is possessed of more than ordinary merit :

A fortress firm is God our Lord,
 A sure defence and weapon ;
 Prompt help in need he doth afford
 Let happen what may happen :
 Our ancient wicked foe
 Full of wrath doth go,
 With much craft and might
 In horrid armour dight ;
 On earth is not his fellow.

 Of our own might we nothing can ;
 We lie forlorn, dejected ;
 There fights for us the rightful Man,
 By God himself elected.
 Dost thou inquire his name ?
 Jesus Christ ? The same !
 Lord of hosts is He,
 Besides him none can be :
 'Tis he the field that keepeth.

 And were this world of devils full,
 For our destruction eager,
 That should not our firm faith annul ;
 We would abide their leaguer.
 The prince of this lost world,
 From his empire hurl'd,
 Though with rage he roar,
 Is judged and can no more ;
 A word shall overthrow him.

 Hold fast that word which must remain,
 Let no dark doubt invade us ;
 He will be with us on the plain,
 With gifts and grace to aid us.
 Let life and honor fall,
 Let them take our all,
 Still our course we'll keep,
 No prize from us they'll reap ;
 For us the kingdom waiteth.

The translation in Dulcken's "*Book of German Songs*," (London 1856) is, like most things in that showy book, very carelessly and superficially executed. It has, however, the correct metre, but indulges in archaisms and is otherwise very rough. But it is interesting to find this and other standard German hymns in such a collection as Dulcken's, and his reasons for it are full of hope for the future religious life of Germany. He says (p. 259), "Although, strictly speaking, songs of this class would scarcely be expected to form a portion of a work like the present one, yet it is impossible to give a complete sketch of German Song Literature while this important branch is unrepresented. The finest productions of the sixteenth century are in the department of religious song. Luther and his followers, Paul Fleming and a number of writers of the sixteenth century, inculcated religious truths by means of hymns, which to the present day have never ceased to be popular." Of this particular hymn and of Luther's hymns in general, he says: "Under the title of 'Luther's Hymn' this sacred song is already well known among us; and deservedly so, for it is redolent throughout of the burning zeal and undaunted intrepidity of the great Reformer. * * * The hymns of Luther formed a noble model for German religious song. They have deservedly kept their place to the present day in the hearts of the people, and are to be found, in forms more or less modified, in every Protestant collection of German hymns."

Our God, a tower of strength is He,
A good defence and weapon;
From every care he helps us free,
That unto us doth happen,
The old evil foe
With rage now doth glow;
Much cunning and great power.
His fearful armour are—
On earth there is none like him.
With our own might is nothing done,—
We soon are lost and fallen;
There fights for us the righteous Man,
Whom God himself hath callen.
Dost ask who He is?
Christ Jesus, I wis;
The Lord Sabaoth,—
There is no other God,—
And he must be triumphant.

Though the world full of devils were,
 All ready to devour us,
 Still have we not such grievous fear,—
 The victory is for us.
 The prince of this earth
 May scowl in his wrath;
 But powerless must be,
 For judged is he;—
 A word can overcome him.

His written Word shall they let stand,
 And little thanks inherit;
 He fighteth for us in the land
 With his good gifts and spirit.
 And take they the life,
 Goods, fame, child and wife,
 Let all pass away,—
 Small profit have they,—
 The kingdom yet awaits us.

That very interesting and highly creditable volume published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication (Philadelphia 1859) and entitled "*Sacred Lyrics from the German*," contains a version of this hymn by the Rev. R. P. Dunn. The lyrical spirit of this is generally sprightly, but it departs too far as well from the ideas as from the metre of the original to be regarded as a successful translation. It is found on pages 127-129 of the work just named:

A stronghold firm, a trusty shield,
 When raging foes appal us,
 Our God defence and help doth yield,
 When heavy ills befall.
 With ancient bitter hate,
 Such might and cunning great,
 As guides no earthly arm,
 Plotting us deadly harm,
 Our foe attempts to enthrall us.
 Our human strength avails us naught,
 Our struggles soon were ended,
 And we in hellish snares were caught
 Unless by God befriended.
 Know ye our champion's name?
 All heaven tells his fame,
 "Jesus, the Lord of hosts,"
 His might our weakness boasts;
 By him are we defended.
 What though in every path of life,
 A host of fiends, endeavor
 To wound us in the deadly strife?
 Their arts shall triumph never.

The author of all ill
 May threaten as he will;
 His throne and empire proud,
 But for a time allowed,
 A word shall end forever.

God's testimony standeth sure,
 Whatever man betideth,
 He makes the weakest saint endure,
 Who in his grace confideth.
 Though the best gifts of life,
 Our foes seize in the strife,
 We cheerful let them go;
 No profit have they so,
 For heaven ours abideth.

In the "*Hymns for Church and Home*," which, as we are told upon the title page, was "compiled by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as a contribution to any addition that may be made to the hymns now attached to the prayer book" (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1860) No. 248, is a translation of our hymn by Bishop Whittingham of the diocese of Maryland. The excellent taste of this collection generally in addition to the well known ability of Bishop Whittingham as a writer, is a sufficient guaranty of the poetical and devotional qualities of this contribution to the hymns of the English language. It very faithfully reproduces the metre of the original and can thus be sung to its proper tune. It is, however, very far from a literal translation, as any one familiar with the original will at once perceive. The first stanza is, perhaps, the greatest departure from the original, and yet has no little of its spirit. But the fourth and fifth lines, introducing an entirely different idea, fall far below the vigor of Luther when he speaks of "the old enemy full of malice, in deadly earnest, with mighty power and deepest cunning as his terrific armor." The second stanza, one of the most difficult to reproduce in English, is much more successful, but we scarcely recognize "The right and true," as an equivalent for "der rechte Mann," (the proper Man!) of Luther. The sixth line of this stanza is also weakened by the introduction of the words "*we claim*," as a part of the answer to the question, "Dost ask for his name?" The third stanza is greatly weakened by the second and fourth lines, and the fifth, "*Their threats are no worth*" is scarcely admissible as an English construction.

But this translation of the characteristic hymn of the great leader of Protestantism in its most critical hour, by

one of the leading minds of the Episcopal Church in the new stadium upon which it is now entering in America, is certainly invested with a peculiar interest, and will be read with more than ordinary attention by the thoughtful reader. It is very appropriately placed under the heading of "FAITH," and stands first under that rubric. It is as follows:

A mountain fastness is our God,
On which our souls are planted:
And though the fierce foe rage abroad
Our hearts are nothing daunted.
What though he beset,
With weapon and net,
Arrayed in death-strife?
In God are help and life:
He is our sword and armour.

By our own might we naught can do;
To trust it were sure losing;
For us must fight the right and true,
The man of God's own choosing.
Dost ask for his name?
Christ Jesus we claim;
The Lord God of hosts;
The only God;—vain boasts
Of others fall before him.

What though the troops of Satan fill'd
The world with hostile forces?
E'en then our fears should all be still'd:
In God are our resources.
The world and its king
No terrors can bring;
Their threats are no worth;
Their doom is now gone forth;
A single word can quell them.

God's word through all shall have free sway,
And ask no man's permission;
The spirit and his gifts convey
Strength to defy perdition.
The body to kill,
Wife, children, at will,
The wicked have power,
Yet lasts it but an hour!
The kingdom's ours forever!

In addition to this decade of translations of Luther's Battle Song, about as many more have fallen under our notice, which our space does not permit us to insert in this article, and any briefer presentation might do them injustice. Some of them are beneath criticism, whilst others are

possessed of very decided merit either as close translations or as spirited imitations. Many of them, like a large part of the Anglo-German literature of America, labor under the disadvantage of being the productions of men but imperfectly acquainted with the language, in which they write. The great difficulty, however, is, undoubtedly, inherent in the metre of the fifth, sixth and seventh lines of each stanza, which, by dropping a syllable, have changed from the iambic to trochaic measure, requiring also, in the seventh, a line of five syllables to rhyme with one of six in the eighth line. There can be no doubt that this is contrary to all the principles of harmonious versification whether in German or in English. We have already referred to the early attempts to correct this in the German words and tune. A comparison of the following versions will make our statement clear. The first, which we may call Iambo-trochaic, follows the received text, the second, in pure Iambics, is what we believe the metre of the text ought to have been, and in which alone a smooth English version is possible :

A LITERAL VERSION.

A safe stronghold our God is still,
A sure defense and weapon ;
He will deliver from all ill
That unto us can happen.
Our old bitter foe
Yearns to work us woe ;
Strong and cunning, he
Is arm'd full fearfully ;
On earth is not his equal.

By strength of ours we naught
can do,
The strife full soon were ended ;
But for us fights the champion true,
By God himself commended.
Dost thou ask his name ?
Christ Jesus ! The same
Lord of hosts we call,
God bless'd over all—
He'll hold the field triumphant.

Tho' Satan's hosts the earth should
fill,
All watching to devour us,
We tremble not, we fear no ill,
They cannot overpow'r us ;
This world's prince may still
Scowl fierce as he will,

A VARIATION.

A safe stronghold our God is still,
A sure defense and weapon ;
He will deliver from all ill
That unto us can happen.
Our old and bitter foe
Is fain to work us woe ;
In strength and cunning, he
Is arm'd full fearfully ;
On earth is not his equal.

By strength of ours we naught
can do,
The strife full soon were ended ;
But for us fights the champion true,
By God himself commended.
And dost thou ask his name ?
'Tis Jesus Christ ! The same
Whom Lord of hosts we call,
God bless'd over all—
He'll hold the field triumphant.

Tho' Satan's hosts the earth should
fill,
All watching to devour us,
We tremble not, we fear no ill,
They cannot overpow'r us.
This world's false prince may still
Scowl fiercely as he will,

His threats are but vain,
We shall unharm'd remain.
A word shall overthrow him.

God's word unshaken shall remain,
Whatever foes invade us,
Christ standeth on the battle plain,
With his own strength to aid us;
They may take our life,
Goods, fame, children, wife—
When their worst is done
They have but little won,
The kingdom ours abideth.

His threat'nings are but vain,
We shall unharm'd remain,
A word shall overthrow him.

God's word unshaken shall remain,
Whatever foes invade us.
Christ standeth on the battle plain,
With his own strength to aid us;
What tho' they take our life,
Our goods, fame, children, wife?
E'en when their worst is done
They have but little won,
The kingdom ours abideth.

Both these versions have the common fault of being stiff and harsh, which is almost inseparable from a translation that endeavors to follow the words of the original as closely as possible, in a metre so peculiar, abrupt and irregular. All that we claim for it is, that it is somewhat less rugged than other translations that reproduce the original metre, and seems to us to depart less from Luther's ideas than any translation, with which we are acquainted. Perhaps some one who has a higher poetical temperament than falls to our lot, and greater skill in versification than we can boast, may, ere long, surpass the imperfect mosaics which are here presented, as feeble imitations of Luther's rough but imperishable granite—but, until that is done, ours may stand as the best that we could do in so good a work. For a good work we cannot doubt that it would be, to kindle in the minds of English readers and of those who worship God in the latest modifications of German speech, which we call English, that lofty courage, unwavering faith, and heavenly devotion, which breathe forth in every line of this imperishable pæan of the Reformation.

ARTICLE V.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By PROF. L. STERNBERG, A. M., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.

The protracted and bitter controversy which arose among the Reformers of the sixteenth century in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper has unhappily been revived

within the last few years in our American Lutheran Zion, nor can those, who stand on the defensive, as friends of the Church and of truth, retire from the conflict however reluctant they may be to mingle in the strife.

In this paper the writer proposes to enter upon a calm and dispassionate investigation of the subject, though he would not conceal from the reader the fact that he feels deeply interested in the issue of the controversy, as fraught with weal or woe to our beloved Church in her future development.

Our first inquiry will be, What do the Symbolical Books teach on this subject?

As "the Augsburg Confession is the only distinctive Symbol universally recognized in the Lutheran Church" we turn to its tenth article which reads as follows: "Concerning the Holy Supper of the Lord it is taught that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the form of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. The opposite doctrine is therefore rejected. This is a literal translation of the German copy. The Latin copy reads as follows: *De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuuntur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes.*

This article of our venerated Confession is variously interpreted. Some maintain that it teaches a spiritual presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements and a spiritual eating of the same, while others claim that it teaches the true corporeal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements and a literal eating of his body and drinking of his blood.

If the former interpretation is the true one, then, not only the rigid Symbolists in our own Church, but also the many able writers in other denominations, who with one voice declare that the Lutheran Church, in her acknowledged standards, teaches the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, must be regarded as slanderers of the mother Church of the Reformation, or as incapable of understanding her explicit and repeated declarations on this subject.

If the latter interpretation is the true one, then this doctrine must be subjected to the test of Scripture, and if, upon a careful exegesis of the texts bearing upon the point, it is

found to be sustained by God's word, then must it be received however confounding it may be to human reason.

Though no ecclesiastical authority can impose upon any one the duty of embracing an error, yet that error may be of so fundamental a character, it may so permeate the whole doctrinal system as to necessitate a withdrawal from the communion in which it is taught. This is happily not the case in the present instance. Should it appear that the Lutheran Church, in her doctrinal standard, has fallen into error on some minor points in respect to which Christians may agree to differ, yet, on the great fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, her testimony is confessedly so clear and decisive, that these defects are but as spots in the sun.

Furthermore, while in our American Lutheran Church the Augsburg Confession is our acknowledged creed, it is not received as to its every jot or tittle. The pledge recommended by the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States to be required of candidates for licensure and ordination is in these words, "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?" In addition to this many of our District Synods have more specifically declared their position, especially in regard to the Sacraments. Thus the Hartwick Synod, in 1837, long before the present Symbolistic controversy arose in our Church, in a copy of the Augsburg Confession with notes, issued under its sanction, employed the following language in reference to the tenth article: "In relation to the subject of this Article, the committee would observe that the Evangelical Lutheran Church does not now materially differ from other Protestant denominations in this country. We believe that the Lord's Supper is a commemoration of the sufferings and death of Christ, and that in this sacred ordinance, every worthy communicant receives the body and blood of Christ under the emblems of blood and wine, that is, he is made a partaker of the benefits which Christ purchased for him, when he suffered and died on the cross." To the same purport was the action of the same Synod in 1856, when by an almost unanimous vote it rejected among other errors, imputed to our Church, the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, nor has any member since called for the rescinding of that action on the ground that he believes in the doctrine of the

corporeal presence. Other District Synods have similarly defined their position.

In the investigation of the subject before us we are thus freed from any ecclesiastical trammels, which are so apt to warp the judgment, inasmuch as the recognized position of the General Synod, as well as of most of its constituent Synods, while strenuously maintaining the great doctrines of the evangelical system, has ever been adverse to that of a rigid symbolism.

When we attentively examine the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession it seems to admit of but one interpretation. It declares that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the form of bread and wine, and are there administered and received. The reception here spoken of is evidently by the mouth. This appears more clearly in the Latin than in the German copy, *et distribuuntur vescentibus*, and are distributed to those eating.

As Melancthon wrote and Luther approved of the Augsburg Confession we are bound to receive their explanation of their own language as recorded in the other Symbols, even if we do not accord to these any confessional authority.

In the Apology Melancthon expresses himself as follows: "Our adversaries" (the Roman Catholics) "do not object to the tenth article, in which we confess that the body and blood of Christ our Lord, are truly present in the Holy Supper, and there administered and received with the visible elements, the bread and wine, as hitherto maintained in the Church, and as the Greek canon shows. And Cyril tells us, that Christ is corporeally administered and given to us in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for he says: We do not deny that, by true faith and pure love, we are *spiritually* united with Christ. But that we should have no union at all with him according to the flesh, we certainly deny; besides it is also utterly repugnant to the scriptures. For who will doubt that Christ is even thus the vine, and we are the branches that receive nourishment and life from him? Hear Paul (1 Cor. 10: 16, 17,) For we being many are one bread. Think you that the power of the divine blessing in the eucharist is unknown to us? For where we receive it, the consequence is, that Christ even dwells in us *bodily*, through the participation of his flesh and body. Again, hence it is to be observed that Christ is in us, *not*

only by spiritual union through love, but also by natural communion. And we are speaking of the presence of a living body; for we know as Paul says, Rom. 6: 9, that, Death hath no more dominion over him." Here Melancthon carefully distinguished between a spiritual and a bodily presence of Christ, and declares that in the eucharist there is the presence of a living body, and that the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession coincides in this respect with the doctrine of the Romish and Greek Churches.

In Luther's Smaller Catechism we find the following language: What is the Sacrament of the altar? Answer. It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, with bread and wine, (*sub pane et vino*) instituted by Christ himself for us Christians to eat and to drink (*ad manducandum et bibendum*, literally for chewing and drinking). That corporeal eating is here meant is evident from the question which follows: "How can bodily eating effect such things? It is therefore not spiritual eating which is referred to.

In the Larger Catechism Luther declares that the Sacrament of the Altar "is the true body and blood of our Lord, in and with bread and wine (*in et sub pane et vino*), commanded through the words of Christ, for us Christians to eat and to drink."

In the Smalcald Articles the doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper is set forth in the following words: "Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, we hold that the bread and wine in the eucharist are the true body and blood of Christ, which are administered and received not only by the pious, but also by impious Christians." This language clearly excludes the idea of the spiritual eating of Christ's body and blood. In this sense the impious, being destitute of faith, do not and cannot eat. The reception of the body and blood of Christ is oral. That this is the view which Luther and his coadjutors intended to inculcate is further manifest from his own language quoted in the Formula of Concord. These are his words: "I reckon all those in the same numbers, that is, as Sacramentarians and fanatics—for such they are—who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Supper is his *true natural body*, which the ungodly, or Judas, as well as St. Peter and all other saints, received *orally*; whoever, I say, will not believe this, should be let alone, and not expect to hold fellowship with me; and to this principle I must adhere." Here Luther most

emphatically declares that the natural body of Christ is received orally, that is, it is literally eaten with the mouth; that it was so received by Judas as well as by St. Peter, and that he regards all, as Sacramentarians and fanatics, who will not believe this. It is well known that the Sacramentarians held to a spiritual presence of Christ in the eucharist and to a spiritual eating of his flesh and blood, whose doctrine Luther here rejects with abhorrence. It can not therefore be that the Augsburg Confession was intended to teach this doctrine, or that this was the case with any of the Symbols that Luther wrote or sanctioned.

In the Formula of Concord, after a pointed condemnation of "the gross Sacramentarians" who believed that "nothing more than bread and wine are present, administered and received with the lips," and of the more pernicious ones who admitted a spiritual presence through faith, we find this language: "Now under these specious words they conceal the gross opinion of the former class, namely, that in the Lord's Supper, there is nothing present, and received with the lips besides bread and wine." The writers then go on formally to state the Lutheran doctrine as follows: We believe, teach and confess, that in the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially, or substantially, present, and with the bread and wine, are truly administered and received." Again we find the following language: "For they teach that, as in Christ, there are two unchanged natures united inseparably, so in the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the two substances, the natural bread, and the true natural body of Christ, are together present here on earth in the instituted administration of this Sacrament." This language is too clear and explicit to admit of our mistaking its import. Nor can we suppose that the first Symbol teaches a doctrine which the subsequent ones so pointedly condemned. They are but a fuller development of the first. If this be so then the Augsburg Confession teaches and was intended to teach the corporeal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, and the reception of his veritable body and blood by the mouth of the communicant.

If any are still disposed to maintain that the Augsburg Confession, whatever may be said in regard to the other Symbols, teaches a spiritual presence and a spiritual eating of Christ in the eucharist, with such we can have no controversy, for in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper we

substantially agree, however we may differ in our interpretation of the tenth article of our Confession.

We proceed to submit the doctrines of the corporeal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements to the test of Scripture. We ask the reader carefully to note the following passages, Matt. 26: 26-29; Mark 14: 22-23; Luke 22: 19-20; 1 Cor. 10: 16-17 and 11: 23-29. If we attentively consider the language of the New Testament as recorded in the above citations we find that, instead of teaching the presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated bread and wine, they clearly exclude any such idea. "This is my body," is by no means equivalent to saying, "In this is my body." It does not and cannot mean the same thing, and yet these last words precisely express the doctrine of the symbolical books on this subject. "*In pane, sub pane, cum pane.*" If it had been the intention of Christ and his apostles to teach any such doctrine we should have found an *in*, *sub*, or *cum* in at least some of the passages cited above. Instead of this they all explicitly declared, not that the body of Christ is present in the bread, but that the bread itself is the body of Christ and that the wine is his blood. There is no union, sacramental or otherwise, of two distinct substances, natural bread and the true natural body of Christ. The bread itself is called the body of Christ. Its character has not been changed by addition, subtraction, or transmutation. It is simply bread, so called after consecration, broken from a common loaf, and devoted to a sacred use. "The bread which we break" &c. Both the Roman Catholic and the Symbolic Lutheran put a gloss upon the words of the institution. They thrust an idea into them which they do not express. The transubstantiationist understands them as if they read, This (which was bread) has become my body. The consubstantiationist understands them thus, In and with this (bread) is my body; and though both make thus free with the plain words of Christ, they are quick to denounce those who differ from them as perverting the word of God. It is easy to see that, while there is no very essential difference between the two ideas above indicated, as the Reformers themselves maintained, the former does even less violence to the language of the institution than the latter.

Since, in every instance in which the words of the institution occur in the Sacred Scriptures the bread itself and not something in it or united with it is called the body of Christ,

and the wine itself is called his blood, the language is necessarily metaphorical, for nothing can actually be both what it is, and what it is not at the same time. Will any one maintain that the same substance can be at the same moment a piece of inanimate matter and a "living body?" We have authority in the very words of the institution for a metaphorical interpretation: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Here obviously are two figures of speech. The word cup stands for the wine in it; and the cup is said to be the New Testament. Is there no metaphor here? Will any stickler for a literal interpretation maintain that the chalice, or even what it contains, is literally the New Testament? As no one would presume to claim a "real presence" here, so we say that, in the same sense in which the cup is the New Testament, the wine is the blood and the bread is the body of Christ. Where the apostle Paul says, "For we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread," is not his language figurative? Are Christians by partaking of the Lord's Supper converted into one natural loaf and one natural body?

Again, in the verse preceding the one last quoted the apostle says, "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" This passage is especially relied on to prove the union in the eucharist of natural bread and wine with the natural body and blood of Christ. If it taught any such doctrine it should read, "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not *in communion with* the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not *in communion with* the body of Christ?" Instead of this we are told that the cup itself is the communion of the blood of Christ, and that the bread itself is the communion of the body of Christ. While bread and wine may set forth a communion and may be partaken of in such a manner as to foster such fellowship, they cannot in themselves be a communion. The communion they set forth is that of the believer with the broken body and shed blood of Christ; his fellowship with his sufferings and death; his being crucified with him that he may also rise and be glorified with him. It is the fellowship for which the apostle Paul so earnestly strove "through the faith of Christ," that he might "know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." Phil. 5. 10.

But, if Christ be not corporeally present in the consecrated elements—if they are objectively only bread and wine, how can the unworthy communicant become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord? We first reply to this question by asking another. How does the unworthy communicant become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord on the supposition of the corporeal presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine? It will not be pretended that his sin is allied to that of cannibalism, for both worthy and unworthy communicants would, in that case, fall under the same condemnation. As our Saviour entered the temple though it had been made a den of thieves, casting out them that bought and sold, and overturning the tables of the money changers, it will not be pretended that the sin of eating unworthily consists in thrusting the body of Christ into a human body which is not a fit temple of the Holy Ghost. Eating unworthily consists, not in the fact, but in the manner of eating.

That is it, replies the advocate of the real presence, for does not Paul say in the context, "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body.*" Here we are informed wherein eating unworthily consists, viz: in *not "discerning the Lord's body."* Now, does "discerning the Lord's body" consist in not discerning his corporeal presence in the consecrated elements? But how is this to be distinguished? Surely not by the sense of sight, for it is administered under the form (*sub specie*) of bread and wine. Is it then by the sense of taste? No, replies the advocate of the "real presence," not by any of the bodily senses, but by faith. But that is certainly a novel way of discerning. We had always supposed that faith was "the evidence of things *not seen.*" Because I believe that a departed friend is in heaven, do I discern him there? Do I distinguish him among the throng of worshippers in the upper sanctuary? But supposing that a present material substance were discernible by faith, what kind of faith is meant? Is it faith in Christ? or is it faith in the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist? If it is faith in Christ, how does it come to pass that such a multitude of the most devoted followers of Christ, "of whom the world was not worthy," never discerned Christ's body and blood as present in and united with bread and wine, nay, rejected the doctrine with abhorrence, as a pernicious relic of popery? If discerning the Lord's

body consists in believing in his corporeal presence in the consecrated elements, then thousands of the most eminent and successful ministers of Christ such as a Doddridge and a Baxter, together with an innumerable multitude of humble, earnest disciples of the meek and lowly Saviour, have all their life long been eating and drinking damnation to themselves. Can any one persuade himself that to such the holy communion has never proved a blessing, ever a curse?

When we read the entire passage, 1 Cor. 11: 17-34, it becomes evident that the apostle aimed to reprobate in the strongest terms "feasting and faction" in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Great irregularities had crept into the Corinthian Church. They came together for gluttony and drunkenness. "This," says the apostle, "is not to eat the Lord's Supper." It is wickedly to pervert its object, which is to bring us, through faith in the crucified Redeemer, into closer fellowship with his sufferings on the cross; with his broken body and shed blood. The Corinthians, not recognizing this sacred use of the elements and partaking of them for gluttony and drunkenness, thus ate and drank to their own condemnation. They "crucified the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame," and thus, in effect, like the multitude who cried "Crucify him," became guilty of his blood.

If it be a correct principle of hermeneutics that Scripture should be interpreted by Scripture then we have abundant authority for interpreting the words of the institution as metaphorical. Christ is called a vine, a foundation, a cornerstone, &c. We have a remarkable instance of figurative language in regard to this very matter of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ in John 6: 53, 54. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Our Saviour himself declares that this is to be understood in a spiritual sense. In the Formula of Concord (Bk. of Con. p. 673) it is admitted that a spiritual eating and drinking are here spoken of.

Was the Lord's Supper, as first instituted and administered by Christ himself, a real communion? Or was it merely intended as a kind of previous rehearsal for the purpose of instructing the apostles as to the manner of its proper observance? If it was not a real communion then it will not

be claimed that the body and blood of Christ were in that instance actually present in the consecrated elements, and hence the words of the institution, as they fell from the lips of Christ himself, were employed in a figurative sense. If it was a real communion, differing from others only in this that it carried the mind forward to the cross, instead of carrying it back, then also the language of the institution must have been used figuratively, for his broken body and his shed blood could not have been present in the elements, since in that state neither of them was yet in existence. As Christ did not have two bodies, the one broken and the other unbroken, he could not be present in the midst of his disciples in an unbroken body while administering to them his broken body and his shed blood, united with bread and wine, to be eaten and drunk. Even if it could be shown that Christ's body, through the divine nature, with which it was united, was susceptible of a presence which does not belong to mere matter, this presence must, notwithstanding, have been that of the unbroken body with its unshed blood. When therefore our Saviour said to his disciples, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many," he must have meant, This wine, which I have just poured out, sets forth the shedding of my blood; nor could his disciples, seeing him in their midst, not yet crucified, have understood his language otherwise than as figurative.

If it was impossible for the broken body and the shed blood of Christ to be present in the elements, before either the one was broken or the other was shed, so it is equally impossible for them to be present now that his body is no longer broken and the shedding of his blood has ceased. The Lord's Supper is a commemorative rite. It carries the mind back to the crucifixion of Christ. "Do this in remembrance of me." "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death until he come." It is not the glorified body of Christ that is set forth in the Lord's Supper, nor its blood, if a glorified body may be supposed to have blood. It is his natural body, while in the agonies of crucifixion, and his blood shed on Calvary. The broken body was healed again, retaining only the marks of its wounds. The blood shed did not return to the body but was poured out upon the ground like that of the bloody sacrifices under the Old Testament economy. Christ was offered once for all. "This do in remembrance of me," not of me, as I am now, not of me, as I shall be hereafter in my

glory, but of me on the cross, giving my life a ransom for all to be testified in due time.

That it is only in their then state that the body and blood of Christ are set forth in the Lord's Supper further appears from the separate administration of the bread and wine. If a "living body," instead of a dying one, or one just dead were set forth in the elements, the wine, absorbed by the bread, should have been administered in and with it. But they were dispensed apart, showing that they refer only to that brief period in the history of our Saviour, when his body and blood were in a state of separation. Christ hung on the cross only a few hours. In their then state his body and blood exist no longer and therefore cannot be present any where.

Besides the natural impossibility of the presence of Christ's broken body and shed blood in the eucharist, and the unscripturalness of the idea, it is philosophically absurd. We are aware that the advocates of this doctrine deny a gross, Capernaïtic eating, and a definite, circumscribed presence. If this disclaimer amounts to any thing it sets aside the doctrine of the "real presence" itself, for it implies that Christ's body has ceased to be a material body—that it has acquired the attributes of deity, and God cannot be eaten. They call the presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements a *sacramental presence*. This is indeed "darkening counsel by words without knowledge." Can any one inform us what is meant by a *sacramental presence*? The Scriptures authorize no such phraseology, which conveys no intelligible meaning, and which the advocates of the doctrine of the corporeal presence seem to have invented, that they might thus relieve themselves from the insuperable difficulties they encounter the moment they undertake to define their position in expressive and precise terms. To some minds indeed, predisposed to mysticism, the words "sacramental presence" may convey a world of meaning. We do not object to the coinage of new terms provided they are significant and appropriate, but we wish at least to know distinctly what is meant by them before, recognizing their right to a place in the formulary of our faith.

But we are told that this is a great mystery, incomprehensible by our limited faculties. Be it so. We cannot comprehend the doctrine of the Trinity. We can, however, understand what that doctrine is. The word trinity is an intelligible term. Not so the phrase "sacramental presence."

It is employed to mean a presence in a definite, circumscribed place which is not local; the literal presence of flesh and blood, which is not literal flesh and blood. Whether language be intended to convey or conceal our thoughts, this does neither, for it expresses none except such as every man may choose to put upon it. We might as well speak of a London presence, unless, peradventure, we should mean simply a presence in London.

As we do not know the essential nature of a spirit whether finite or infinite we cannot comprehend in what manner it may be present in any place. Its relation to surrounding space is rather like that of a mathematical point than like that of a solid, for it does not itself occupy space. Though we may conceive of its presence as similar to that of matter, yet all that we really can say is that where it acts, there it is. Thus the body is the "local habitation" of the soul, yet who will tell us how it occupies this "earthly tabernacle," or at what particular point it dwells?

We may know as little, as to the essential nature of matter as of spirit; but this we do know that their phenomena are entirely unlike, and that it is one of the essential properties of matter to occupy a definite space. This being the case, how can there be the presence of a material substance which is not determinate?—a presence of the body of Christ in the bread which is not local (*localem inclusionem*),—an eating, which is not gross? There does seem to be something exceedingly "gross" in the eating of a "living body," however refined and etherialized it may have become, for it still belongs to the world of matter, which it must do in order to be eaten at all, for we can neither eat nor drink a spirit. If "in the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the two substances, the natural bread, and the true, natural body of Christ, are together present here on earth in the instituted administration of this Sacrament," the eating of Christ's natural body is at least as gross, as the eating of the bread. Both are eaten with the mouth. Both are masticated and swallowed. The Formula Concordiæ after speaking of the spiritual eating declared, by our Saviour, to be necessary, John 6: 54, says, "The other mode of partaking of the body of Christ is *oral*, or *sacramental*, when in the Lord's Supper, the true essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken of orally, by all who eat and drink of the consecrated bread and wine, in this holy Sacrament." To disclaim therefore a local presence of the body

of Christ in the consecrated elements, and a gross eating of the same is to give up the doctrine of the corporeal presence altogether and to assume the ground of the Sacramentarians, viz : that the presence and the eating of Christ's body and blood are both spiritual.

To this it is replied, that while this would be true in respect to a merely human body, it is not true in regard to the body of Christ in consequence of the union in him of the divine with the human nature in one person. But how can this alter the case, unless the human nature, in consequence of this union, has become divine, and the body has ceased to be a created, material substance? When the Symbolical Books tell us that "the true natural body of Christ", his "living body" is eaten with the bread by both worthy and unworthy communicants, they teach either a gross eating, or a spiritual eating. They reject the idea of a spiritual eating, they must therefore teach a gross eating, though disclaiming the imputation.

By no means replies the advocate of the doctrine of the corporeal presence. This doctrine is not liable to any such objection, because of the *idiomatic union* of the divine and human natures in Christ. As the Bible says nothing of a "*communicatio idiomatum*" we may be allowed to inquire into the grounds, on which it is predicated. Did, then, the second person in the adorable Trinity, in assuming our nature, either himself acquire human attributes, or impart divine attributes to the man Christ Jesus? As well might we say that the soul becomes material in consequence of its union with the body, or that the body becomes immaterial by its union with the soul. In a personal union the component parts retain all their essential attributes, nor is it possible that they should be transfused, especially in the person of Christ. To assert anything of the kind is to assert a contradiction. While the infinite may enter into union with the finite, it cannot itself become finite, nor can the finite become infinite. This omnipotence itself cannot effect, otherwise God could create another God who, as God, must be uncreated and eternal. Though the union between the divine and human natures in Christ is as real and intimate as between the soul and body in man, yet, just as what is predicable of man is not always predicable both of his soul and of his body, as when we say, man is mortal, or, man is immortal, so it is in regard to him who was "God, manifest in the flesh." When our Saviour is spoken of as "born of a wo-

man," as increasing "in wisdom and stature," as eating, sleeping, crucified, dead, and buried, he is presented under his human aspect. None of these things are predicable of the Deity that dwelt in him, however much the fact of such indwelling may enhance their significance and value. On the other hand when our Saviour is spoken of as healing the sick, raising the dead, forgiving sin, mediating between God and man, giving life to as many as he will, bursting the bands of death, equal with God, creating and upholding all things by the word of his power, he is presented under his divine aspect. Christ is even called a man (John 1: 30,) in reference to the period, previous to his incarnation. None of these things are predicable of his human nature, however necessary it may have been for the accomplishment of the great object of his mission, that he should take upon him "the seed of Abraham."

It is said that our Saviour "knew what was in man." These words assert his omniscience. Was his human nature omniscient? How then could he increase in wisdom? Furthermore, it is impossible for a created and finite mind to be capable of infinite knowledge, either in itself or through union with Deity. Did Christ's human body become omniscient as well as his human soul? This must have been the case on the supposition of the "*communicatio idiomatum*," at least if on this supposition the possibility of his corporeal presence in the eucharist is to be accounted for. God cannot, for one moment, be divested of a single attribute, for he would then cease to be God. Christ, though during the period of his humiliation he had veiled his glory, was then as really omnipotent and omnipresent as before his incarnation. Did both his human body and his human soul become omnipresent and omnipotent when he was "made in the likeness of sinful flesh?" In the miracle of healing wrought upon the nobleman's son, as recorded in John 4: 46-54, particular mention is made of the fact, that the sick youth was at Capernaum, while Christ was at Cana. He thus exerted his divine power, where his bodily presence was not.

Nor does it relieve the difficulty to say, that it is the glorified body of Christ, that has become ubiquitous, omnipresent. Glorified though it be, it still is created, material, limited and cannot be omnipresent. An omnipresent creature, an omnipresent material organism cannot exist. If the body of Christ were ubiquitous then we should eat it, not only in the Lord's Supper, but with our daily food; we should inhale it

with the air we breathe; we should quaff it with every refreshing draught, but it could only be received by fragments, and not as a whole.

To teach the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine is to *deify Christ's body*. Is Christ's glorified body present, wherever the Lord's Supper may be celebrated, though it be in different and distant places and at the same instant? Yes. Is the whole of Christ's natural body present in each piece of the broken bread and administered to each communicant? Yes. Well then Christ's body is God, and the Christian eats his own God, when partaking of the Lord's Supper and that too a material God, as only material things can be eaten, for none but God can be in many and distant places, whole and undivided, at the same time. Furthermore, as the whole of Christ's body is in every piece of the bread, and as it is his "living body," it also contains his blood, and the cup is not necessary to be administered either to priest or laity to make a complete sacrament.

Again, is the blood of Christ united with all the consecrated wine? Yes. Does each communicant in tasting the wine drink all the blood? Yes. But how can one communicant drink all the blood, and yet leave it all for the next to drink. Because it is omnipresent and indivisible. Then it is God, for the existence of one divine attribute implies the existence of them all. The body of Christ being omnipresent must likewise be omniscient and omnipotent. A human body, a living organism, omniscient, omnipotent! If the body of Christ be indivisible and he that eats or drinks the least particle of it eats or drinks the whole, then not only is the blood in the bread, but the body is in the wine, and partaking of the wine alone would be a complete sacrament.

To this the advocate of the corporeal presence replies, that he does not claim that the glorified body of Christ is ubiquitous in its own nature, in which it occupies a limited, circumscribed space, but that it is so *through* the divine nature, with which it is united. But let the fact be established before we inquire into the manner, in which it is supposed to exist. The fact is an impossibility in the nature of things. There is no mode in which a thing can really be the opposite of what in its nature it is and must be. If the human in Christ had changed its nature, so as to acquire divine attributes in consequence of its union with the second person in the Trinity, then we should not "have such an High Priest

as became us, one that can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." If Christ's human nature was invested with the attributes of Deity by the incarnation, then there was no need of any incarnation at all. Either there was an assumption of the human nature into the divine nature, or the human nature remained human and limited.

Is the body of Christ *really* ubiquitous, or only *virtually* so, through its union with the divine nature? If a *real* ubiquity is asserted, then a real divine attribute is ascribed to Christ's body. If the ubiquity is only *virtual*, this destroys the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist. Luther says, that the one body of Christ has three different ways of being present in a place, first, "the comprehensible or corporeal mode," second, "the incomprehensible, or spiritual mode," and third, "the divine and heavenly mode." We are not concerned with the mode in which Christ's body may be supposed to be ubiquitous, but with the fact which we entirely deny, as contrary both to Scripture and reason. Did not Christ tell his disciples, at the institution of the Last Supper, that he would not henceforth partake with them in its celebration until he should drink with them the new wine in his Father's kingdom? Did he not ascend to the right hand of God, there to remain as to his corporeal presence until his second coming? The Formula of Concord indeed tells us that the right hand of God, to which Christ ascended is everywhere. In refutation of this it is sufficient to quote Mark 16 : 19.

But we are told, that if there be a single point in the Universe where the divine nature in Christ is present, but his human nature is not, then there the two natures are not united. This objection is based on the idea that the presence of the Creator and of the creature are identical, that the incarnation of God involves the assumption of the human nature into the divine; otherwise the objection is of no force. Can Christ act only through the organs of his human body? When the Church addresses her worship to her ascended Lord, does she believe that he hears her prayers and praises through the bodily sense? When she leans upon the arm of her beloved does she lean upon an arm of flesh? Wherever Christ is and whatever he does he is and does, as God incarnate; but what is predicable of him as such is not predicable of each nature separately. Had the apostle Paul but understood this doctrine of the "*communicatio idiomata*"

lum" it would at once have solved his grave doubt as to whether the *man* he knew who was caught up into Paradise was in the body or out of the body. He must have been in the body, because he was a man and not half a man, and because if his soul had been but for an instant, where his body was not, in so far there could have been no personal union between them. Were it even true, it would throw no light on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in regard to which the glorified body of Christ has no significance, however much it may have in other respects.

We cannot regard the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, when intelligently embraced and carried out to its logical results, as a harmless vagary. It is well calculated to inspire a superstitious reverence for the elements and thus interfere with their legitimate use. In its essential features it does not differ from the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, as the Reformers themselves admitted, and its tendency is of a similar character. Though not perceived to be in conflict with the great doctrine of justification by faith by those who first originated it, yet it really is so, inasmuch as it teaches an objective efficacy in the consecrated elements to those who partake of them, instead of a subjective value in the proper observance of the Lord's Supper. Instead of being simply a means of grace it becomes a source of it, through the operation of that which is eaten and drunk.

The indwelling Christ, introduced through the mouth, is supposed to ensure the forgiveness of sins and to become the germ of the saint's resurrection body. Many pass lightly over the words of the institution, as though they read, "Do this, for the remission of sins." Even in the Formula Concordia this idea is already broached. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, can have no other meaning than that which St. Matthew and St. Mark give; this (namely, this which you drink out of the cup orally,) is my blood of the New Testament, by which I establish, seal and confirm unto you children of men this my Testament, and new covenant, namely, the remission of sins." According to this language that which is drunk orally by the communicant *establishes, seals and confirms* to him the remission of his sins. Other passages of similar import might be quoted. It is easy to perceive that the natural tendency and practical effect of

such teaching must be similar to that of the Romish dogma of transubstantiation, of which perhaps few of our older pastors have failed to witness illustrations.

In the Lutheran system of theology, so clear, so pre-eminently biblical on the great fundamental doctrines of the word of God, the peculiar views in regard to the Sacraments constitute the one dark spot. We wonder not at finding a defect like this, which a later age has in a great part remedied. Our only wonder is that the Reformers were able, to so great an extent, to break away from the instructions of their childhood and the teachings of their riper years. These views, however, tinged as they are with the hierarchical element, or we should perhaps rather say with ecclesiasticism, are, in so far, in conflict with the system itself, which, in all its leading features, sends the sinner *directly* to Christ for salvation, and not to Christ *through the Church*.

The Church has indeed a most important office to perform. As a faithful foster-mother, she is to receive Christ's nurslings and train them up for heaven. But the ecclesiastical system, which naturally culminates in the hierarchy and finds its full development in the Romish Church, places the keys of the kingdom of heaven in the hands of the Church. You must be born again. Go to the Church, that you may be regenerated by baptism. You must receive the remission of your sins. Go to the Church, that you may have this remission established and sealed to you in the Lord's Supper.

We do not affirm that this is the instruction, actually given under this system, but that such is its tendency and practical result. In proof of this we need but refer to the fact that, except in the case of our American Lutheran ministers, by whom the doctrines of baptismal regeneration and of the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist have generally been discarded, our pastors are so frequently called on to administer the ordinances "in extremes." A delicate infant comes into the world but for a few moments to utter its feeble cry of distress and then to be borne by angel hands to a happier clime. The pastor is hastily roused from his midnight slumbers and summoned to baptize the little sufferer, ere the Saviour calls it to himself. Should he tarry, the father, or even the attending midwife, may perform the friendly office. The strong man is suddenly prostrated in the agonies of speedy dissolution. He may have lived in utter neglect of

his Christian duties since his first communion. But now the pangs of death are upon him, and the pastor is summoned to prepare him for his exit by administering to him the Lord's Supper. If only the sacred emblems pass his lips, while yet the breath of life is in his body, then it is thought all may be well. Is it said that these are abuses of the doctrine of the Sacraments, as taught in the Symbolical Books, which deny their efficacy "*ex opere operato*?" They are abuses, however, which grow out of the doctrine as its natural fruit; and they occur, alas, too often.

Though we regard the peculiar Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper, as unsustained by the Sacred Scriptures, yet it is based on a great and important truth, which it had been well had the Reformers been content to enunciate, unencumbered by the dogma of the real presence. The most rigid Symbolic Lutheran whose views are not too contracted to enable him to disregard the form, where he finds the substance, will experience no difficulty in fraternizing with one who agrees with him in the great truth underlying the peculiar, Lutheran view, though not its proper root; nor will he be disposed to deny his claim to the name of Luther, none the less honored, because not blindly followed.

What then is this essentially though not distinctively Lutheran view? It is that the Lord's Supper is emphatically Christ's ordinance as baptism is that of the Holy Spirit. When our Saviour was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended upon him in the form of a dove. This ordinance not only sets forth the work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men, but whatever spiritual blessings may attend its administration are wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost. On the other hand the Lord's Supper sets forth the work of Christ, and whatever spiritual blessings may attend its observance, it is the peculiar office of Christ to impart. Where Christ ascended to heaven to occupy his mediatorial throne, the holy Comforter, proceeding from the Father and the Son, came to supply his place and carry forward his work. In the other ordinances of religion, he takes the things of Christ and shows them unto us. But in the Lord's Supper Christ himself, as at its first institution, presides at the feast. Here the reality of the atonement, the efficacy of the shedding of Christ's blood for the remission of sins, is assured to the believing soul. The universal consciousness of the Church, as expressed in her most favorite Sacramental hymns, recognizes in this ordinance, the special presence of Him who has

promised to be with his followers to the end of the world, when with penitent, believing hearts, they approach his table. While he there communes with them their hearts burn within them and they exclaim, "It is the Lord." There he shows the doubting disciple his hands and his feet, and bids him thrust his hand into his side. There, in tender and reassuring tones, he addresses the disconsolate one, who seeks her Lord and knows not where to find him.

We do not mean to assert that the Holy Spirit does not exert his sanctifying influence in the Lord's Supper through the great truth therein set forth, or that the second person in the adorable Trinity exercises his saving power only in this ordinance; but that here he is peculiarly present to apply "the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel;" present, not in the consecrated elements, but with those who reverently and believingly partake of them; present, not as to his body and blood, his human nature, to be received by the mouth, but as to his divine nature to be received through faith into the heart to speak peace to the troubled conscience, to justify and save.

As on the cross the human nature of Christ suffered, while the divine nature united with it imparted expiatory efficacy to those sufferings; so, in conferring the benefits of Christ's passion, the divine nature, omnipresent, omnipotent, makes the application, while, in consequence of its union with the human nature, "we have such an high priest as became us, one who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," able to save, strong to deliver, and yet our elder brother and our sympathizing friend.

ARTICLE VI.

THE UNIVERSAL FATHERHOOD OF GOD AND THE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD OF MAN, GOD'S ARGUMENT AGAINST OPPRESSION.

There is no one thing, perhaps, in which all religions so fully agree as in the doctrine, or the sentiment that God is emphatically the guardian and protector of the poor and

needy, the widow and fatherless, the stranger and the oppressed. This universal conviction can be regarded in no other rational light, than as an instinct or intuition, and so as the voice of God speaking in and through the soul of man. Hear it pleading as the voice of man, and warning as the voice of God, from the lips of the hero of *Odyssey*:

"Low at thy knee, thy succor we implore,
Respect us human, and relieve us poor.
At least some hospitable gift bestow;
'Tis what the happy to the unhappy owe:
'Tis what the gods require; those gods severe;
The poor and stranger are their constant care,
To Jove their cause and their revenge belongs,
He wanders with them, and he feels their wrongs."⁶

The same sentiment is echoed and re-echoed from the dialogue and the chorus of the Greek tragedies, while the plot often illustrates the vengeance from heaven which is sure, sooner or later, to overtake the wretch who disregards the cry of the suppliant stranger and oppressed. Such is the dictate of conscience and common sense in the ancient heathen world.

And with this agrees the religious consciousness of Mohammedans. The Koran, as interpreted by their priests and judges, puts its ban upon slavery, wherever it is accepted as the law and the religion of the people, by making it impossible for a Mohammedan to be a slave. It is a standing law of all Mohammedan governments, that the slave, the moment he becomes a Mohammedan, thereby, *ipso facto*, becomes free.

The spirit of the religion of the Bible is still more emphatically and impartially opposed to slavery in all its forms, since it recognizes men of all religions and all nations as brethren, and commands us to do to all men all things whatsoever we would that they should do to us. The Scriptures of the Old Testament put the native Hebrew and the stranger within his gates on the same broad and high level, and are as remarkable for the humanity and charity which they require towards men, as they are for the piety which they inculcate towards God, commanding

⁶Od. IX, 265-71. Cf. the oft repeated words: πρὸς γὰρ Διὶς εἶπον ἅπαντες ξείνοι τε πτωχοὶ τε (Od. VI, 207; XIV, 57, &c.)

the Israelites to love the Lord their God with all their heart and their neighbors (including strangers, Lev. 19: 34) as themselves, and extending their especial protection over the blind and the lame, the poor and needy, the helpless and defenceless, just in proportion as they need protection. Over and over again the commandment and the penalty of disobedience sound out together from the law: "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in *any wise*, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry; and my anger shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword, and *your* wives shall be widows, and *your* children fatherless. Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates. At his day, thou shalt give him his hire: for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it; lest he cry against thee unto the Lord and it be sin unto thee." (Ex. 22: 21-24; Deut. 24: 14, 15.)

And the denunciation of God's judgments upon every form of oppression goes on down from Moses through all the prophets, beginning with Isaiah: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen to let the oppressed go free?" (58: 6), thundering still louder in Jeremiah: "Wo unto him * * that useth his neighbor's service without wages." (22: 13), and closing up the canon of the Old Testament with the distinct threat in Malachi, that the Messiah "shall come as a refiner and a purifier and a swift witness against * * those that oppress the hireling in his wages and turn aside the stranger from his right (3: 5). And the New Testament opens, as the Old closes, with the preaching (by John the Baptist) of repentance and reformation with especial reference to violence and unlawful exactions. And the meek and lowly Jesus, while he welcomes to his gracious healing and saving presence the sick and afflicted, the poor and needy, the weary and heavy-laden, and pronounces blessings on the poor in spirit, the meek, the mourners, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness and those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, denounces woes, if possible, more dreadful than any of the prophetic denunciations of the Old Testament, upon the Scribes and Pharisees. The extortioners and oppressors, who bound heavy burdens and laid them on men's shoulders, who devoured widows' houses and, though very religious, were yet full of robbery and extortion.

And the holy Apostles, like their divine Lord, have blessings and only blessings for every body else, but they heap curses on the head of the extortioner and the oppressor: "Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped, have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." (James 5: 4).

Thus the religion of nature and the religion of the Bible, the religion of the Old Testament and the New, of Jews and Greeks, of Pagans, of Mohammedans and of Christians, unite in the sternest denunciation of the oppressor, while they agree in placing the oppressed under the special guardianship and protection of the God of heaven.

While the God of nature and the God of the Bible thus warns and pleads with men for their oppressed and down-trodden brethren, the God of providence interposes in their behalf. So often has he appeared to sweep away from off the earth the kingdom or the empire that was full of robbery and oppression; so often has slavery, with its kindred sins of excess and uncleanness, been the ruin of nations, that God seems to have been repeating and re-repeating the lesson all down the ages of the world's history—the nation that will not obey me in this respect I will judge; the nation that will rob the hireling of his wages and oppress the stranger, I will destroy. Christian nations, especially, God seems, in our day, to be educating in the great Christian duties of charity and philanthropy, training them almost in spite of themselves to understand and practice those much misunderstood and perverted but still truly Christian ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity; bringing them gradually up to a recognition of the rights of the masses, the equality of citizens before the law, the ties of nationality, and the independence of nations of foreign intervention, and thus preparing the way for that consummation foretold in prophecy, and devoutly wished by philanthropic, pious hearts, when war and oppression both shall cease; when nation shall no longer rise up against nation, and every man shall see in every other man a brother.

The nation that will not learn this lesson, must make way for others that will. This is the touch-stone by which the nations of Christendom are now being tried. In the balance of this great and decisive question, our beloved country hangs suspended in this fearful crisis of our national history. It is a test by which a *republic*, a *Christian Republic*,

a *Christian Republic in this nineteenth century of the Christian era*, ought to be willing to be tried. And yet there is too much reason to fear, that, weighed in this balance, we shall be found wanting. Then with better reason, than the proud empire of Babylon, "the great republic" of the West will be given over to destruction. Then clearer and more logical than the hand-writing on the wall of the debauched and besotted king of Babylon will be the MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN of our doom. And the interpretation known and read of all men, will be: "God hath numbered thy kingdom and divided and destroyed it, because thou hast not glorified the God in whose hands thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways," by obedience to his law of fraternal love—because while you gloried in the forms Christianity, you denied the fundamental principles and essential spirit of both.

The principle which underlies this whole subject is so clearly and concisely enunciated in a passage in the Book of Malachi—thus standing as it were between the two Testaments as if expressly to sum up the Old and pre-shadow the New, that we shall adopt it as a kind of motto, and let it give shape to our discussion: "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother by profaning the covenant of our fathers." (Mal. 2: 10).

The Universal Fatherhood of God and the Universal Brotherhood of Man—this is God's own argument against oppression, an argument founded in nature and reason, reaffirmed by revelation, and enforced upon us as upon the ancient Israel by the solemn covenant of our Fathers.

I. The Universal Fatherhood of God.

This is no mere poet's fancy or philosopher's dream. It is a plain and simple matter of fact. It is the great underlying fact of Christianity and of all true religion. It is the central fact also in nature and human history. God is the Father of all mankind, not by a mere figure of speech, but in the truest and highest sense of the word—in a truer and higher sense than human fathers and mothers are the parents of those, whom they call their children. God is the real father of all men, and human fatherhood is only an imperfect image and shadow of his, just as Christ is the only real, complete and perfect man and brother of the race, while our manhood and brotherhood is only a broken and shattered

image of his. The universal fatherhood of God is the keynote of the Lord's Prayer, of the Sermon on the Mount, if not a few other discourses and parables of our Lord, and we might say, of the whole Gospel. Men of all classes and conditions, races and nations, are taught to address him as "Our Father." Jew and Gentile alike are invited to cry unto him, "Abba, Father." Father, Father is the one word which opens the door to all the unsearchable riches of the Gospel of Christ.

Three elements enter into this idea of the universal fatherhood of God.

1. He is the Creator of all mankind. "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?" He created out of nothing the very substance, out of which we were originally formed. Then he fashioned our wonderfully made bodies, curiously working them out of the dust of the earth with infinitely greater skill and fondness for his work than the most gifted and loving sculptor ever wrought the marble into the form of heroes or gods. Then he breathed into our nostrils the breath of his own life, a portion of his own spirit, and made us not only living souls, but intelligent, thinking, feeling, willing spirits, like himself. The fact, that, with the exception of the first man, he created all men through the intervention of human parents, so far from being inconsistent with the idea of fatherhood, just goes to prove that those earthly parents are only the *instruments* and *occasions* of our existence, and so are parents only in a secondary and subordinate sense, while *he* is the primary and original author of our being, the intentional former of our bodies, the conscious father of our spirits and the all-comprehending, efficient cause of that mysterious union which subsists between them.

2. God created man in his own image, after his own likeness. As children partake of the nature of their parents, so mankind all partake of the rational and moral nature of their Father in heaven. He endowed man with reason, conscience, affections, and will, the same mental and moral faculties with himself, that, like himself, he might look out over the divine works and pronounce them all very good, and have dominion over the irrational creatures, and be his agent, interpreter and representative in this lower world; his reason, the image of the divine intelligence; his con-

science, the echo of the divine law and the vicegerent of the divine government; his heart, beating in unison with the divine benevolence; his will, the executive of the divine will; his very body erect with dignity and dominion, looking up to his throne and radiant with the light of his countenance and his immortality, the image of God's own eternity. In short, man was made to be in some sense the god of this lower world, the viceroy of the province, the son and heir of the eternal King. True, the distance is infinite between the Creator and the most exalted of his creatures. And we should never forget reverently to exalt him in our conceptions as infinitely above unfallen man in his natural attributes and infinitely unlike fallen man in his moral perfections. At the same time, Adam was "the Son of God;" and as even the new born infant resembles its parents, so the son of God bears some real resemblance to his heavenly Father; as "the cope of heaven is imaged in a dew-drop," so man reflects the image of his Maker. The difference is a difference in degree, not in kind. Man *is* like God in his rational and moral nature; he can *become* like him in moral character. He was made like him in both; and though sadly fallen by sin from this high original, yet, by the grace of God through his dear Son, we may recover his moral image, and rise to his likeness and blessedness not only, but to his presence and glory forever.

Both the fatherhood of God and his likeness to his human offspring are recognized as a doctrine even of natural religion in Paul's admirable discourse to the Athenians on Mars' Hill: "For in him, we live and move and have our being, as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are his offspring. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or stone graven by art and man's device."

3. As God is in the highest sense the father of mankind and may even be conceived of, as some of the early Greek poets represented him, as at once the father and the mother of the race, so he exercises the fulness of a father's and the tenderness of a mother's love for his offspring. Nature teaches this in the beauty, grandeur and richness of the world which he has filled up for their abode; never did human father build and furnish such a magnificent house for his favorite son and heir, as God has fitted up for all his children even here on earth, in the wise and benevolent care with which he has provided for their maintenance and edu-

cation. Never did earthly parents make such ample and costly provision for the maintenance and education of their family, as God has made for all, even the most unfortunate of his earthly children.*

And revelation teaches us not only to call him Our Father, but to ask him for our daily bread, to trust him for food who has given us life, for raiment him who has given us the body, for sanctification and salvation him who has already given us the soul and his only begotten Son; to cast all our cares upon him, assured that he knoweth them all and careth for us; to come to him with all our wants, relying on this divine argument, that "if we, being evil, know how to give good things to our children, *much more*, MUCH MORE will our Father in heaven give good things to them that ask him."

We need not fear, that we shall exaggerate this doctrine of the fatherhood of God, our creation in his image and participation in his nature, or his more than parental love and tenderness towards us. It is not a figure of speech. It is not a fiction of the imagination. It is a reality, the great fundamental reality of our being, nature and relations to God. We may misunderstand it. We may draw false inferences from it. But we cannot exaggerate it. The only danger is, that we shall fail adequately to conceive of God's more than parental relation and affection towards us, and to meet it by a more than filial love and trust towards him in return.

There is another sense in which "we all have one father," not perhaps distinctly contemplated in our text, but scriptural and adding emphasis to our argument. The Scriptures have always been understood to teach, (and it is difficult to see how they can be fairly interpreted otherwise than as teaching), that mankind are all the offspring of one *earthly* father, being all descended from one human pair; that, in common with our first parents and in consequence of their first disobedience, we have all fallen from our original holiness and happiness into a state of sin and misery, involving not only temporal but spiritual and eternal death; and that in this sad dilemma, the Son of God, himself God, took upon him our nature, died for our sins, rose again for our justification, and with our nature united in one person to his divine nature, he ever lives and reigns for the benefit of all who

*Plutarch urges these arguments in proof of the immortality of the souls of men. *De Sera Numinis Vindicta*. Cap. XVII.

believe on him. We have not time to prove or illustrate these propositions; though physical and philosophical science lend no small confirmation to the unity of the race in origin as well as in species, and nature is not wanting in striking suggestions of the fact of human apostasy and the possibility, not to say probability, of a *remedial* system. But admitting the facts as revealed in the Scriptures, they not only lend a new meaning to the question and so new truth and force to the argument, "Have we not all one father," but they exhibit the fatherhood of God to us in a new and most interesting aspect. Apostate, fallen, ruined as we are by sin, God is not willing to give over our race. He still yearns with *more* than a father's love and compassion over his prodigal sons. He will still recover some of them, at least, and make them more than ever his grateful, dutiful, loving children. His own Son, only begotten, dearly beloved, the brightness of his glory, the perfect image of himself, will incarnate himself in human nature, and thus bind that fallen nature most intimately to his own sacred person, thus breathe into that dead nature something of his own divine life. And all the children of men who will believe on him, shall be regenerated, born again of the Spirit of God, and be made the sons of God in a new, peculiar, two-fold sense. United to him by faith they shall be made part-takers again, and yet more fully, of the divine nature and with the very spirit of his beloved Son, shall cry unto him, Father, Father; and he in turn will exercise towards them, as one in Christ, something of the same love which he cherishes towards his well beloved Son.

II. The Universal Brotherhood of Man.

Three elements enter also into this idea, corresponding to the three which we have found in the universal fatherhood of God.

1. If we all have one father, even God, then we are all brethren. And if God is our father, not in a merely figurative or subordinate sense, but rather in the highest and most emphatic sense, as he is the original and efficient author of our being and pre-eminently the father of our spirits. Then we are all brethren, not by a mere figure of speech, not in any inferior relation, but our universal brotherhood is, in some aspects, even more sacred and binding, than the special relation which we usually call by that name. We feel bound by a tender tie to those who are sprung from the same earthly ancestry. Should that be esteemed a less

sacred bond which unites all who are the offspring of the same Father in heaven? It is often a touching and endearing thought, that we are, like Cowper, the children of "parents passed into the skies." Shall we not feel drawn towards the poorest and humblest of our race at all times, and especially every morning and evening, when we offer the Lord's prayer, by the consideration, that we and they are all the children of the same Father, and that no other than him whose dwelling has always been in the high and holy places?

2. If we all partake of the nature of our heavenly Father, we all partake of the same nature with one another. Wide as the line of demarcation is which seems to separate the civilized from the savage, the European from the African, it is a mere faint and fading line in comparison with the chasm which divides the lowest order of humanity from the highest class of the brutes. For the former is only a difference, of degree, while the latter is a difference in kind. Nay, the difference between man and his Maker is only a difference in degree, and therefore is not so radical a difference as that between man and the irrational creatures. Reason, conscience, speech and religion constitute an impassable boundary between the lowest man and the highest brute. Reason, conscience and immortality ally all men to their Creator and thus bind them all to each other, as brethren, by the indissoluble bonds of the same rational, moral and immortal nature.

3. As God loves all mankind with true fatherly affection, so we owe to every human being a real and sincere brotherly love. And as our heavenly Father feels a peculiar tenderness towards those of his children who most need his pity (even as the fond parent watches and prays and toils and weeps with peculiar tenderness over the erring and the suffering child), so our hearts should go out in tender compassion towards our fellow men, only so much the more as they are wretched and degraded, down-trodden and oppressed. Enough, that they are the children of our own father, the dearest of fathers and the greatest and the best—though they be degenerate children; this alone should entitle them to a truly fraternal sympathy and interest.

Our view of the universal brotherhood of man is complete only when we look at it on the human side as well as the divine. If we all have the same first parents on earth as well as the same Father in heaven, then we are all brethren

by a double bond of unity. Then we have the same father in the flesh as well as the same Father of Spirits; and will we turn away and "hide ourselves from our own flesh?" We sometimes speak of some men as made of better clay than others. In reality, all men are made of the same dust of the earth. It is a bond of union between us and others to know, that we and they have the same blood flowing in our veins. In reality the same blood flows in the veins of every son and daughter of Adam. We pride ourselves much on blood, and family, and race. In fact we are all of one blood, that of our first parents—all of one family, the family of man—all of one race, the race of mankind. "God hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." This was the humbling and leveling doctrine which Paul preached from the bema of the Areopagus to the Athenians, who were proud above all the Greeks (and all the Greeks gloried in the impassable barrier between themselves and *barbarians*) of their pure *autochthony*.

And the Apostle more than once connects this doctrine with another which is still more humiliating—binds the Athenians to the other Greeks and the Greeks to the barbarians by a bond of brotherhood which is still more offensive to the pride of race or nation. Our common blood, the blood of the whole human race is *tainted by sin*—a fact which humiliating as it is, is recognized by the traditions and the universal consciousness of men as distinctly as it is revealed in the word of God. We are brethren in the apostacy, being apostate children of apostate parents; brethren in sin and shame, in guilt and misery, none of us being without sin and therefore none of us having the right to throw the first stone at any poor sinner of our mortal race; brethren in sorrow and suffering, in trials and temptations and infirmities, and shall we not cover the nakedness of our own kindred?

But blessed be God, there is a glorious counterpart to this humiliating truth. We are brethren in the apostacy. But we are brethren also in the redemption and recovery, that is in Christ Jesus. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ all may be made alive. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we may, we *shall*, if we are united to him by faith, bear the image of the heavenly." Christ has taken upon himself our fallen human na-

ture, and lifted it up, hallowed it, and put honor upon it, making it but a little lower than the angels, even while he dwelt on earth, and then exalting it to the eternal throne in heaven. Christ has united himself to our "sinful flesh," and sanctified it, ideally and potentially for the race, really and personally in every individual, who, by repentance and faith, voluntarily united himself to him. Christ has infused his own pure and vital blood into our human veins and is gradually purifying and vivifying the heart and life of the race, removing the taint of sin and the poison of death and pouring in his own spiritual and heavenly life. For thus it is written, "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening, that is, a life-giving spirit. Renovated by vital union with him and adopted in him as the sons of God, we become brethren in the Lord, because we all have the same elder Brother; brethren in honor and true blessedness, because we have been redeemed by the same Saviour from the same state of sin and wretchedness; brethren in the most vital and joyful sympathy, because we have all been incorporated into the same body, the body of Christ.

Such are the great facts in the history of our human race—truly *wonderful* facts we should deem them, if our sensibilities were not blunted by familiarity; such our nature and relations to God and mankind; such the universal fatherhood of God and such the universal brotherhood of man, as they are revealed to us in the Scriptures, and more or less attested by science and the consciousness of men. Now what is the obvious inference? What are the lessons of duty, indissolubly linked to such facts in our own consciences as well as in the divine argument of the Scriptures? Manifestly lessons of charity, philanthropy and universal love. Manifestly lessons of liberty, equality and fraternity, not indeed as held by schools of infidel philosophers or clubs of radical revolutionists, but of liberty, equality and fraternity as taught in the law of God and the Gospel of Christ. Lessons in the exalted dignity of human nature—much as this language has been perverted and abused, it is a Scriptural and a Christian sentiment, *the exalted dignity of human nature*, not indeed as ruined by the fall, and degraded and defiled by sin, but as originally made in the image of God and as exalted again by the incarnation, exaltation and glorification of the *Son of Man* at the right hand of God. Lessons of sympathy and compassion for the poor, the afflicted the

oppressed and down-trodden, derived at once from the dignity and the degradation of human nature, from a thoughtful consideration of what man is, and also of what he is capable of becoming, is yet destined to become. In a word, a lesson of the sacredness of our common humanity, as seen in the fact that we all have one father, and we are all brethren, a sacredness scarcely less tender and touching when contemplated on the weak human side, than it is solemn and commanding when considered in the loftier and grander aspect of our common relation to our Father in heaven.

Men are prone to magnify the differences of birth and native talent and family and race, the distinctions of rank and caste and wealth and power. And they usually prize more highly that by which they are distinguished from other men, than those things which they enjoy in common. But Christ overlooked all these outward distinctions, looked beyond and beneath them and saw him only in those common elements of humanity in which they are all essentially alike as rational and accountable beings and as sinners whom he came to redeem. And therein he proved himself to be the *Son of God*; for God "looketh not on the outward appearance but on the heart," and looking down from heaven into the heart of man, sees them all alike by nature sinners, and if any are righteous in his sight, it is only because they have been renewed and sanctified by his grace. Therein he showed himself to be the SON OF MAN also, not the son of one man or the representative of one class or nation, but the Son of *Man* and the representative of our common humanity.

Nor is it difficult to show that this is not only the Christian, but the rational and right view, the only broad and deep and true aspect, in which man can be contemplated and seen as he is. The differences are not small between the civilized man and the savage, the prince and the peasant, the master and his slave. But after all how many more are the things in which they are essentially alike than those in which they differ. And of how much higher intrinsic dignity and importance are these things. How much more they pertain to the character. How much more essential they are even to the happiness of the possessors. The same Father in heaven, the same earthly parentage, the same human nature, the same bodily organs, so superior to those of the inferior animals, the same mental and moral faculties which exalt man, as man, so far above the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air. The same consciousness of accounta-

bility to a higher than any human tribunal, and a destiny reaching infinitely beyond the bounds of this earthly existence. The love and care of the same heavenly Father and the same common bounties of his providence—the common light, the common air and the common earth from which no caste, color or class can be wholly excluded. The common fruits of the earth, without which the wealthiest nabob can no more feed and clothe himself than the meanest slave, and the common rain and sunshine, without which the wisdom of the scholar, and the power of the autocrat are alike impotent to raise a blade of grass or a kernel of corn. The same human infirmities, the same limitations of the bodily or mental faculties, the liability to the same diseases of body and mind, exposure to essentially the same dangers, difficulties and trials and the same entire dependence on God for health, strength, success and life itself. The same *moral* weaknesses, temptations to be resisted, evil dispositions to be overcome, and sins to be forgiven, and the same Redeemer from the penalty and the power of sin. And after all real and all possible external differences, essentially the same deep and abiding fountains of pleasure or pain, of joy or sorrow, the same heart-aches, disappointments and dissatisfactions with the world, the same restless longings after something higher and better, when the world has done all it can to make them happy. Thus few and trifling, thus accidental and unessential are the differences; thus numerous and important, thus fundamental and essential the common elements in the extremes of human life, even as they appear to our imperfect vision. We can readily infer, that in the sight of God, as he looks down from heaven and sees things just as they are, these accidental differences will appear as nothing, and all men must stand before him involved in the same essential weaknesses and sins, invested with the same inalienable rights and dignities.

The doctrine of the equal and inalienable rights of man is not a dogma of a leveling and atheistic philosophy, but a law of nature and a law of God. Every *man* has an equal right to *be* a man, to be what God has made him, to use and enjoy what God has given him, to exercise and develop his bodily organs, to educate and exercise his reason, conscience, affections and will, all his mental and moral faculties. And since God has created all men with essentially the same attributes, of physical, mental and moral beings, every man is

bound by the law of his being, to regard and treat every other man as he would regard and treat himself in like circumstances; in other words, to love his neighbor as himself and to do unto others all things whatsoever he would have them do to him. So that the golden rule, though not discovered by the light of nature, is, in fact, a law of nature, a rule of human duty, co-extensive with the platform of human rights and, like that, founded in the nature of man and his relations to his Maker. Before the law and government of God, it is the duty of every man to love every other man as himself, and the right of every man to be thus loved and treated by every other man. And the laws of men approximate to the perfection of the law of God, just in proportion as, overlooking all mere accidental differences, they enforce upon men of all classes and conditions the performance of the same sacred duties, and secure to all the enjoyment of the same inalienable rights.

The man who really knows himself, and properly considers himself, will not be likely to wrong another man. He will hardly be unforgiving, who considers, how much he needs to be forgiven. They will hardly throw stones at others who remember that they themselves live in glass houses. He will hardly look down upon any other man who is conscious of all the depths of degradation, into which he is capable of falling, and has actually fallen in the sight of God. And he who estimates duly the dignity and capacity of his own immortal spirit and the infinite price at which, in common with every other human soul, he has been redeemed, will not dare to rob any human being of that which makes him a man. Enslave a *man*! It is to rob him of his humanity. It is to treat him like a brute, as if he had no reason, conscience or will of his own, no right even to worship God without the consent of his master, no resemblance to the divine nature, and no title to immortality. Buy and sell a *man*! It is to treat him as property. It is to make him a *thing* and no man. It is not only to strip him of property, family and all that he values around him, but to rob him of himself. Well may the poor slave, bound and beaten, look up to his oppressor with imploring look, as in the picture with which we are all familiar, pleading, "Am I not a man and a brother?" And the oppressor's hand would fall powerless at his side at the sight of his fellow man, his neighbor, his brother, thus weeping and pleading before him, if he had not already lost his own humanity. Of all

"man's inhumanity to man," enslaving him is the most inhuman; it so utterly *dehumanizes* the slave, and so dreadfully *inhumanizes* the master. This is a new lesson which the world will learn from the rebellion and the war which slavery is now waging against the government and the free institutions of our country, or rather it is a new illustration of that old lesson, the blinding, perverting, hardening and utterly depraving power of sin. In its whole history, from its first inception, it has been a war not only against liberty and law, not only against the fundamental principles of religion and morality, but, at length, a war against the instincts of nature and the common sentiments of humanity. Do you call this prejudice, and ask for the proof? Compare the utterances of Southern pulpits, synods and other ecclesiastical bodies half a century ago with the justifications and glorifications of slavery which, for a few years past, have been waxing louder and louder from the same sources till they have filled the ears and stifled the conscience of the South; and say, if the world ever saw so rapid and so deplorable a degeneracy in theology and religion. Compare the speeches and the votes of Southern statesmen during the first half century of our national existence with the speeches and the votes of the same States, and the very same men during the last quarter of a century—compare, above all the chivalrous honor and stainless integrity of Southern men in the Cabinets of Washington, Jefferson and Monroe with the shameless falsehood, fraud and treason of Southern men in the Cabinet of Buchanan; and say, if political morality ever experienced so sudden and so sad a blight. Do you doubt the growing unnaturalness and inhumanity of the slaveholders' war? Ask the graves of Northern soldiers at Manassas, rifled of their sacred contents as trophies of savage triumphs. Ask the women of Winchester, and I know not how many other places, unsexed as well as barbarized and inhumanized, shooting down our too-forbearing soldiers from the windows, as they retreated, exhausted through the streets. Ask the hospitals and prisons of Richmond and Petersburg and Salisbury and Charleston, or rather let our returning prisoners recount, how they were deprived of suitable food and pure water, how they were shot at, if they approached the grated windows of their prison and tyrannized over and tortured; and how the Union men of the South are wasting away in prisons and dungeons, and hung on trees and put to death in a thousand barbarous ways, or drag out an exist-

ence in ignominy and agony, worse than death. Hear Parson Brownlow and Chaplain Eddy and Col. Corcoran tell the story of their own wrongs and the horrid sufferings and persecutions of their fellow-prisoners, and say, if slaveholders themselves have not put the finishing stroke to the overwhelming argument, by which the Senator from Massachusetts demonstrated "*the Barbarism of Slavery.*"

The fundamental wrong, which underlies all the other wrongs of the slaves and their unhappy race, is not recognizing them as human beings, and therefore, not acknowledging that they have any rights which other human beings are bound to recognize. This inhuman doctrine leads inevitably to inhuman treatment, and inhuman treatment leads again legitimately to more inhuman doctrine. And thus the process of corruption and degeneracy has been going on, till, at length, almost the whole country, North as well as South, has been more or less blinded and hardened against the rightful claims of a whole race of human beings whose only crime is their misfortune, whom we have first robbed of the most precious rights and attributes of humanity, and then attempt to justify ourselves by the very degradation and ruin, which we ourselves have brought upon them.

Never was a more inhuman sentiment uttered by human lips than that which proceeded, not from the Supreme Court of the United States—thank God! we were saved that humiliation—but from the Chief Justice of that Court, not only disfranchising but dehumanizing with a stroke of his inhuman pen four millions of human beings born in our own country, and the inhabitants of a whole continent across the Atlantic, and harmlessly publishing it to the world as a fact in American history and an article in the code of American laws, that "black men have no rights, which white men are bound to respect." And that inhuman sentiment is the very corner-stone of the Constitution of the so-called Confederate States of America, as expounded by the Vice-President of the Confederacy; nay, the very Gospel which, as the Southern press with one voice now declare, "Our Confederacy is a God-sent missionary to preach to the nations."*

And (with sorrow and shame be it spoken) the same inhuman sentiment is still cherished in the hearts of too many of the people of these *United States*, is still clung to by too many of our civil and military officers with the tenacity of a

*Richmond Examiner, p. 863.

dying struggle, still influences too much the action of the national and some of the State governments, even in the conduct of the war, which the Republic is waging for its very life with the hosts of slavery. In proof of this, we need not revert to the times of ignorance in the early stages of the war, when the legislative and executive departments of the Government vied with each other in eager promises of non-interference with the institutions of the South, and our Generals invaded the territory of rebellious States with loud proclamations, that they would put down with a strong hand all attempts at insurrection among the slaves. We need not recall the long and shameful months, during which the subordinate officers and soldiers in our armies, blushing for shame and burning with indignation, were compelled to perform the office, dishonorable even at the South, of jailors and catchers of fugitive slaves, and loyal men, faithful servants of their country, after bringing intelligence to our commanders, piloting our boats, guiding our armies, rendering invaluable service to our cause, simply because their skin is of a darker hue than that of their oppressors, were given up into their hands and literally scourged to death in sight of the American flag, and almost in sight of the American Capitol. In this third year of the war, after the President's proclamation of emancipation, marking a new epoch in the war, and a new era in the history of our country, and our age, and after all the marvellous progress which has been made in the education of the public sentiment, while I write, I read with sorrow and shame, of contrabands on the Mississippi, who had assisted our troops in finding and putting on board several boat-loads of cotton, left behind trembling and shrieking to fall into the hands of their infuriated masters; of fugitive slaves in New Orleans driven back by the bayonets of Massachusetts soldiers to be the property of their so-called owners, and the victims of their long and cruel oppressors; and most monstrous folly as well as injustice and cruelty of the colored regiments who covered themselves with glory in the heroic assault on Port Hudson; the colored regiments alone among the heroes of that assault provided with no stretchers or ambulances for their wounded, and, when provision was made under a flag of truce for bringing all the others who had fallen, their dead alone not included in the arrangement!*

*See Vicksburg Correspondence of the New York Times, June 13.

ognize colored men, as men and brethren, and treat them like other men, and extend to them their rights as human beings, and use them just as we would other men, without inquiring the color of their skin, in all ways in which they can be employed for the accomplishment of the ends of the war, and *extend to them the same protection* which our flag spreads over other men, whether as laborers or soldiers, who render the same service, and consider their rights and interests as sacred as any other equal number of men, women and children in our population? Do we not still to a great extent, ignore the existence of four millions of human beings, and one-third of the entire population of the Southern States, the majority of the inhabitants, and the only loyal inhabitants of some of the States? Do we not overlook *their* interests; forget *their* rights, leave *them* out of the account in our calculations? Do we not *practically ignore their very* existence, and that too when we stand in extreme need of their assistance, when they might, could, would and should fortify *our* camps and fight in *our* ranks instead of the enemy's, when every month's experience makes it more manifest that their full and hearty co-operation would turn the scales in our favor, while, with their weight thrown into the opposite scale, we never can effectually conquer the rebellion, and when their prayers, cries and tears for deliverance are of more account in the sight of God, of more *weight in his balance*, and therefore, certain to outweigh in the final issue, all the wealth and pride and power of the Southern aristocracy, age, and all the vaunted material and military resources of the North? I know not which is the more amazing the wickedness or the folly and madness of such prejudice. It is the very essence of caste, of a caste worse than heathenish in this Christian land. Jefferson said, he trembled for his country, when he remembered that God is just. I tremble for my country even now, when I remember that God is, in an especial manner, the God of the *stranger* and the *suppliment*, the protector of the poor, and the avenger of the oppressed. Has he not said, "If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will *surely* hear their cry; and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless?" In view of such solemn declarations is it superstition to believe, at least to fear, that it is this very thing which is sending defeat on our armies, disaster to our cause, and mourning into all our cities and towns, into almost all our

homes and hearts? I fear, that the sin of oppression is not all on one side in this war, that the God of the suppliant and the stranger, the God of the more than widowed and fatherless, the God of those who are robbed not only of their wages but of their wives and children and themselves, has somewhat against the North as well as the South; that public sentiment and even legislation in some of the Northern States is oppressive and inhuman; that the government of the States and the nation is not yet in full harmony with the law and government of God in its conduct towards the millions of helpless and defenceless human beings, who have been recently thrown upon it for protection and look to it as their only human hope; that God could not bring the war to a close in the present state of public sentiment and governmental action on this great question without bestowing a premium on inhumanity; and, if he could and would, that we are neither fit for republican freedom nor capable of it, till we understand better, and better practise the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that solemn "covenant" which our "fathers" entered into before God and mankind, and which we glorify with our lips while yet in practice, as a nation, we cast it behind our backs and trample it under our feet. Was there ever a more inhuman act of law-making or constitution-making than that article which lately received the sanction of a majority of the votes, (I trust not a majority of the voters) of the State of Illinois, forbidding negroes henceforth and forever to enter the boundaries of the State? How much better is such an article in the Constitution of Illinois, than that which they boast as the corner-stone of the Southern Confederacy. There is but one step further in inhumanity, and that is for the citizens of that professedly republican and Christian State to take their stand on the banks of the Ohio, with gun loaded, cocked and primed and as the poor fugitives emerge from the waters of the river in the flight swimming for liberty and life, shoot them down as they do squirrels in their migrations to a Northern clime. What can be more inhuman than the language we so often read in the columns of Northern newspapers, and hear from the lips of Northern men, loyal men, and men who glory in their Republican or Democratic principles, "I care nothing for the negroes, the war is for the benefit of the whites." You do not care for four millions of human beings, your own brothers and sisters, the children of your own Father; you do not care whether they are

treated like men or like cattle, whether they are permitted to live as men, women and children, or slaughtered like wild beasts, hung up like dogs, bought and sold and bound and beaten worse than the very brutes ! Friend, fellow-citizen, take back that inhuman speech ; it was either uttered in thoughtlessness, or you are a monster of inhumanity. Oh, my country, my suffering, bleeding, almost perishing country, turn not a deaf ear to the prayers and tears of oppressed millions, lest they enter into the ears of the God of hosts, and provoke *his* intervention, more powerful than that of all the kingdoms and empires of the Old World, bring down his vengeance, more to be dreaded than all the hosts which treason and rebellion can array against thee ! Oh, my countrymen, scorn not the co-operation of four millions of slaves ! Forget not their rights and interests ! Harden not your hearts against their sighs and groans. Let not their tears and blood cry to heaven against you.

They are your countrymen, loyal almost to a man, the only loyal men in large portions of the South, loving and trusting you in spite of all your indifference to their welfare, willing, waiting, longing to cast in their lot with you, and serve and save the country. They are your brethren, bone of your bone, and flesh of your flesh, children of the same earthly parents, offspring of the same Heavenly Father with yourselves, bound to you by all the sacred ties of a common nature and a common experience. When the God of heaven has so wonderfully thrown upon you, upon the whole people of the country, the responsibility of their protection, education and emancipation, when he asks you almost with an audible voice, "Where is thy brother ?" say not in the spirit of the first murderer, "I know not ; Am I my brother's keeper," lest God in reply shall say, "What hast thou done ? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the earth."

They are the brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ, your Redeemer, and your final Judge. And when you stand before him in judgment, he will say unto you, "I was an hungred, I was thirsty, I was a stranger, naked, and sick, and in prison, and inasmuch as ye ministered or failed to minister unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did or did it not to me." Oh suffer not the brethren of your divine Lord and Master, his brethren not a few of them by generation and adoption as well as by creation, and so members of his own sacred and blessed body—suffer them not to be bound and scourged—suffer them not to be dragged away by your

own soldiers from your own camps and your own Capitol to an ignominy and agony, which you would deem worse than death if inflicted on your brothers or on yourselves. They are the children of God, all his children by nature, all created in his image and loved by him, as the infinite and universal Father alone can love his children, all pitied by him, as the God of heaven pities none but the stranger, the suppliant and the oppressed; many of them re-created in his moral and spiritual image and, therefore, loved by him with something of the same divine complacency which he cherishes toward his first-begotten and well-beloved Son, dear to him as the apple of his eye, and the Son of his love. And will you enslave, or be a party to the enslaving of a son of God, you, who would pronounce him a fellow fit only for the gallows, who should kidnap your son? Men of America, Christian men, shall the image of God always be bought and sold in your country? Shall the children of God always be bound and scourged and tortured in America for no crime but a skin, not colored like your own? Shall the American Church never be free from the sin and shame of slavery? Shall the great Republic of the West always be a by-word and a scoffing among the nations, as a slave-holding Republic? Forbid it consistency, charity, justice, mercy! Every attribute of God and every right feeling of man forbid it! A just and merciful God will not permit it. Humane and Christian men will not permit it. The conscience and common sense of a free and Christian people will not long permit it, but will rise in their might, as one man, and, as they draw the sword to extinguish this wicked rebellion, they will annihilate utterly and forever that monstrous evil, that sin against God, and crime against humanity, which has been the root of the rebellion, and the cause of all our calamities.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Last Times and the Great Consummation. An earnest Discussion of momentous Themes. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Revised and enlarged edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863 This work was originally published in 1856, and favorably noticed in the *Review*. It is regarded by those who sympathize with the writer's sentiments, as

VOL. XIV, No. 56. 76

one of the ablest discussions, connected with the Millenarian investigations of the present day. To this edition several important additions have been made, such as a complete analysis of Scripture references, which bear on the subject, a full exhibit of the literature, ancient and modern, a number of interesting explanatory notes and an Index, which greatly enhance the value of the volume. Although we do not agree with the author in his peculiar views, they are his honest, earnest convictions, and have the sanction of the highest authority. The book has done good in awakening an interest in the subject of religion. We know an intelligent and educated physician, who had been, for many years, a sceptic, whose attention was first arrested to the consideration of Divine truth by the perusal of this work.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I, Abraham to Samuel. By A. P. Stanley, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. With Maps and Plans. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. This volume, presented to the eye in so attractive a style, consists of a series of lectures, delivered at Oxford. They do not give the history of the Jewish race, but a history of the Jewish Church, particularly of those parts which bear directly on the religious development of the nation. The author never forgets that the literature of the Hebrew race, from which the materials of these lectures are derived, is the Bible; he, therefore, constantly reminds the reader, that the Christian Church sprang out of the Jewish, and endeavors, whenever opportunity offers, to connect the history of the two, both by way of contrast and illustration. Although we may differ from the author in many of his views, as latitudinarian, his candor cannot fail to commend our respect, whilst the valuable information communicated, and the literary beauties of the work, its remarkable discrimination in the use of language, will render it attractive to all Students.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D., Author of the History of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Two volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863. This history, although a separate work, may be regarded as a continuation of the author's former history of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. It is not merely a Memoir of Calvin, but a history of the times, in which that Reformer lived, and over which he exercised so important an influence. The deep interest felt in that eventful period as well as the great skill and power of D'Aubigné, as a writer, will secure for the work a wide circulation.

The Pentateuch vindicated from the aspersions of Bishop Colenso. By William Henry Green, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. New York: John Wiley. 1863. This is a brief, clear and satisfactory reply to Colenso's extraordinary attack on the Pentateuch, and a triumphant vindication of the historical character of the Sacred Record. The author is a fine Hebrew scholar, and in the task undertaken evinces much learning and critical ability. He easily detects the errors, and in a vein of quiet humor skillfully disposes of the alleged discrepancies and inconsistencies. He takes up the Bishop's charges in the order, in which they are presented, answers his positions in detail, and completely demolishes the work.

The Confessions of Augustine. Edited with an Introduction by G. T. Shedd, D. D. Andover: W. F. Draper. 1860. The deep piety, undoubted sincerity, and remarkable experience of Augustine have thrown a charm around his Confessions, which will give them permanent in-

fluence, and attract the attention even of those who cannot always subscribe to his reasonings or endorse the conclusions which he reaches. This beautiful edition is a revised reprint of the old translation, carefully compared with the original Latin text, to which are added some valuable explanatory notes.

The New Testament, with brief explanatory Notes or Scholia. By Howard Crosby, D. D., Professor of the Greek language and literature in Rutgers College. New York: Charles Scribner: 1863. These notes are not disquisitions on the sacred text, but rather hints and suggestions, intended to remove obscurities, reconcile inconsistencies and to explain grammatical peculiarities and archaeological difficulties. Many of the suggestions are new and striking, evidently the result of thorough scholarship, presented briefly and in the most simple manner. The volume will prove an aid to Biblical teachers as well as to private Christians in harmonizing, elucidating and enforcing Scriptural truth.

Bible Illustrations. Being a storehouse of similes, allegories and anecdotes, selected from Spencer's "Things New and Old," and other sources. With an introduction by the Rev. Richard Newton, D. D. and a copious Index. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863. The title sufficiently indicates the character of the work. It is a collection of varied, apt and suggestive illustrations, a *thesaurus* of moral and religious truth, gathered from classic authors, and Christian writers of all ages and countries, designed to elucidate or improve some important doctrine lesson. The book will be found useful to ministers of the Gospel, to teachers of Bible classes, and to all who have to do with the instruction of the young.

Triumphs of the Bible, with the Testimony of Science to its truth. By Rev. Henry Tullidge, A. M. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. This is a book on the evidences of Christianity, designed to meet a popular want, and to show that the success of God's word in overcoming obstacles, and accomplishing wonders is an irresistible argument in favor of its divine origin. Its truth and authority are vindicated, its harmony with the discoveries of science and archaeological investigations proved, and some of the more prominent and plausible objections of modern scepticism successfully answered.

Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel. By Francis Wayland. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. There are few men in the country whose opinions are entitled to a more careful and candid consideration than Dr. Wayland. His large experience, extended observation, strong sense, practical character and earnest piety fit him to speak with more than ordinary authority. His thoughts are always valuable, even when they do not secure conviction. In these ten familiar letters he discusses topics of vital importance, such as a call to the ministry, its essential qualifications and duties, the characteristics of sermons and the manner of delivering them, pastoral visitation and ministerial example. The author takes decided ground against the use of the manuscript in the pulpit. The book will be read with profit by all, clergymen and laymen, who are anxious to promote the efficiency of the Christian ministry.

Tales and Sketches. By Hugh Miller. Edited with a Preface. By Mrs. Miller. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. There is a deep interest, connected with all the writings of the distinguished author, and the volume before us contains his earlier and lighter productions, giving us his views of men and things more clearly, and letting us into his inner life more fully than his other works. We were particularly interested in his recollections, told with so much simplicity and pathos, of the unfortunate poets, Ferguson and Burns.

My Mother's Chair. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863. This is an interesting little book, by the wife of a highly esteemed Lutheran minister, and is worthy a place in our Sunday School libraries.

The Rebellion Record. Edited by Frank Moore. New York: C. T. Evans. The last number completes the fifth volume of this important serial, of which we have so frequently spoken in the highest terms. It is indeed a storehouse of authentic information on all points connected with the great Southern Rebellion, and will, from year to year, become more and more valuable. No Library can be regarded as complete without this important publication.

Harper's Magazine. The June No. contains several most excellent articles. Two of them are beautifully illustrated. The one on the Quicksilver Mines of New Almaden, furnishing an instructive description of those mines, and the process of working the ore—and the other on the Indian Massacres and War of 1862, giving a thrilling account of those tragical scenes, from which the people of Minnesota suffered so much.

The Atlantic Monthly. The last No. of this valuable monthly contains many able and interesting articles. The contribution by Dr. Lewis on "Weak Lungs and how to make them strong," is worthy of serious attention. Consumption is treated by the author, not as a local disease, but as a disease of the system, manifesting itself in the lungs. If removed from the lungs and yet not eradicated from the system, it will speedily re-appear somewhere else or show itself in some other form.

The American Publishers' Circular and Literary Gazette, promises to be a more complete and successful publication than any thing of the kind that has hitherto appeared among us. It is surprising what an amount of interesting and valuable information in reference to books, authors and publishers at home and abroad, is here collected. It is a credit to American Literature, and we wish our friend Childs, the enterprising publisher, the most encouraging success in this new field of labor.

Gould and Lincoln have published the *Story of my Career*, being the Life of Heinrich Steffens, as student at Freiberg and Jena, and as Professor at Halle, Breslau and Berlin, with personal reminiscences of Goethe, Schiller, Fichte and others. *J. W. Bradley* has published the first volume of the History of the Civil War in the United States, by Samuel M. Schmucker, LL. D. The second volume was ready for the press at the time of the author's death. *Harper and Brothers* have added two additional volumes, *Sallust* and the *Anabasis of Xenophon*, to their admirable series of Latin and Greek Texts, which to convenience of form unites beauty of appearance and cheapness. A Second Series of sermons is announced by Rev. Dr. Stockton, under the title, *The Book Above All*, or the Holy Bible, the only sensible, infallible and divine authority on earth.

Sunshine in Thought. By Charles Godfrey Leland, Author of "Meister Karl's Sketch-Book," and "Translator of Heine's Pictures of Traul." New York: Charles T. Evans. 1862.

The Problem of American Destiny, solved by Science and History. New York: C. T. Evans. 1863.

The Choice of a Wife: A Lecture to the Graduating Class of Theological Students in the Missionary Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Delivered in Selinsgrove, Pa., June 3, 1863. By B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D. Baltimore: T. N. Kurtz. 1863.

INDEX TO VOL. XIV.

- Abbott's American History, 311
 Andrew's Life of Christ, 460
 Aphorisms on the Practical Explanation of the Scriptures, 351
 Argument against Oppression, 578
 Atlantic Monthly, 312, 602
 Augustine's Confession, 600
 Battle-Song of the Reformation, 537
 Bayne's Testimony of Christ to Christianity, 153
 Bengel's Gnomon, 150
 Bergstresser, Rev. P., Art. by, 365
 Bethune, Memoirs of Mrs., 458
 Bibliotheca Sacra, 311
 Bittinger, Rev. J. B., Art. by, 215
 Book of Job, 1
 Brownlow on Secession, 155
 Bullion's Latin Dictionary, 310
 Caspari's Frank's Friend, 308
 Chambers' Encyclopædia, 459
 Child's National Almanac, 461
 Christianity and Politics, 243
 Christian Sabbath, 365
 Collegiate Education in the West, 306
 Crosby's Notes on the New Testament, 601
 Crusades, 116
 D'Aubigné's Reformation in Europe, 600
 Diehl, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 33
 Dignity of the Ministerial Office, 284
 Döderlein's Latin Synonyms, 461
 Draper's Psalms in Hebrew, 458
 Eberle, Dr., Translation from, 313
 Efficient Ministry, 269
 Eichelberger, Rev. Dr., Reminiscences of, 293
 Emmons' Memoirs of, 458
 Erskine's Constitutional History of England, 154
 Essick, Rev. A., Art. by, 269
 Exposition of Mark IX: 49, 240
 " of Rom. VI: 3, 4, 144
 Finckel, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 336
 Flacius Illyricus, 481
 Focht, Rev. D. H., Art. by, 212
 Focht's Churches between the Mountains, 459
 Frieze's Virgil, 310
 General Quitman, 259
 General Synod, 97
 Gieseler's Church History, 456
 Great Commandment, 132
 Green's Reply to Colenso, 600
 Greenwald, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 144
 God's Argument against Oppression, 578
 Guericke's Church History, 457
 Hadley's Greek Grammar, 311
 Hanson's Latin Prose Book, 309
 Harless, Dr., Translation from, 243
 Harper's Magazine, 155, 312, 602
 Hart's Bible, as an educating Power, 461
 Hebrew Poetry, 390
 Heroes and Martyrs, 311
 Heydenreich, Rev. L. W. Art. by, 382
 Hopkins' Moral Science, 309
 Houpt's Conversations on Engineering, 460
 Hull, Rev. W., Art. by, 284
 Illyricus, M. Flacius, 481
 Irving's Life, 307
 Job, Book of, 1
 Junkin's Political Fallacies, 460
 Knickerbocker, 312
 Kostlin, Dr. Julius, Translation from, 33
 Kurtz's Church History, 150
 Lintner, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 116, 323
 Lord's Supper, 567
 Luther and the Reformation, 336
 Luther's Battle-Song of the Reformation, 537
 Luther's Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, 152

- Luther's Preaching, 313
 Mark IX : 49, Exposition of, 240
 Marsh's Lectures on the English Language, 308
 Martin Luther, 33
 Miller, Rev. Dr. J. B., Art. by, 132
 Miller's Tales and Sketches, 601
 Ministerial Office, 284
 Miraculous Triumphs of the Early Church, 157
 Muhlenberg, Prof. F. A., Art. by, 68
 Müller on the Science of Language, 153
 Murray's Memoirs, 307
 Mussey on Health, 155
 My Mother's Chair, 602
 Mysterior Union of the Divine and Human Natures in the Son of God, 323
 North American Review, 311
 Notices of New Publications, 150, 306, 450, 599
 Oppression, Argument against, 578
 Our General Synod, 97
 Owen's Anabasis, 310
 Paul and James, 382
 Paul's Salutations, 215
 Parton's Life of Jackson, 154
 Politics and Christianity, 243
 Problem of American Destiny, 602
 Public Worship, 60
 Publishers', American, Circular, 602
 Quitman, Life and Correspondence of, 259
 Rationalism and Supranaturalism, 180
 Rebellion Record, 155, 311, 462, 602
 Reformation and Luther, 336
 Reminiscences of deceased Lutheran Ministers, 293
 Resources of the Church, 463
 Reynolds, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 537
 Romans VI : 3, 4, Remarks on, 144
 Sabbath, Christian, 365
 Sallust and the Anabasis of Xenophon, 602
 Salutations of Paul, 215
 Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. C. F., Art. by, 180, 390, 481
 Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. C. W., Art. by 313
 Schlottman, Translation from, 1
 Seiss, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 157
 Seiss's Last Times, 599
 Seiss's Parable of the Ten Virgins, 150
 Self-Culture, 440
 Shield's Manual of Worship, 459
 Smith, Rev. Dr. Few, Art. by, 169
 Spencer's Bible Illustrations, 601
 Spener, Philip Jacob, 68
 Sprague, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 463
 Spurgeon's Sermons, 308
 Stanley's History of the Eastern Church, 152
 Stanley's History of the Jewish Church, 600
 Sternberg, Prof. L., Art. by, 60, 558
 Stevens' History of Methodism, 152
 Stickney's Cicero, 310
 Story of my Career, 602
 St. Paul and St. James, 382
 Sunshine in Thought, 602
 Tholuck, Translation from, 68, 188
 Thomasius, Translation from, 351
 Tullidge's Triumphs of the Bible, 601
 Ulrich, Rev. J., Reminiscences of 298
 Undeveloped Resources of the Church, 403
 Union of Christ and Believers, 212
 Union of the Divine and Human Natures in the Son of God, 323
 Universal Brotherhood of Man, 578
 Universal Fatherhood of God, 578
 Wayland's Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel, 601
 Wedgwood's English Etymology, 154
 Well's Manual of Scientific Discovery, 154
 Wenzel, Rev. G. A., Art. by, 243, 351
 Wescott's Study of the Gospels, 153
 Why did Jesus pray ? 169
 Worship, Public, 60
 Zeller, Translation from, 390

